

370.5

A

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

16TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES

AND

PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

1902

HELD AT JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY AND WOMAN'S COLLEGE,
BALTIMORE MD. FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, NOV. 28-29, 1902

ALBANY

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

1903

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

16TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES

AND

PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

1902

HELD AT JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY AND WOMAN'S COLLEGE,
BALTIMORE MD. FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, NOV. 28-29, 1902

ALBANY

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

1903

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the association	3
Summary of sessions	3
Address of welcome	
Pres. IRA REMSEN	5
Response	
Head Master WILSON FERRAND	7
Should Admission to College be by Examination or by Certificate?	8
Educational Value of Examinations as the Culmination of the Preparatory Course: Dean JAMES E. RUSSELL	8
Methods in Use of Accrediting Schools: Prof. A. S. WHITNEY	20
Effect of College Entrance Examinations on the Secondary Schools: Miss JANE L. BROWNELL	30
Discussion	
Prof. LIGHTNER WITMER	39
Pres. JOSEPH SWAIN	42
Dr JAMES M. GREEN	42
Prof. LOUIS BEVIER JR.	44
Dr HENRY L. TAYLOR	46
Dean JAMES E. RUSSELL	46
Report of College Entrance Examination Board: Prof. THOMAS S. FISKE	47
Report of Committee on College Entrance Requirements in English: Prof. FRANCIS H. STODDARD	50
Relative Functions and Powers of President, Trustees and Faculty	
The President: Pres. IRA REMSEN	51
The Trustees: Dr SIMON J. MCPHERSON	51
The Faculty: Prof. GEORGE STUART FULLERTON	57
Discussion	
Dr JAMES H. CANFIELD	75
Pres. JAMES M. TAYLOR	80
Dean T. F. CRANE	83
President's address: Existing Relations between School and College	84
How should the Entrance Examination Paper in History be Constructed: Prof. LUCY M. SALMON	101
Dr JAMES SULLIVAN	114
Discussion	
Prof. EDWARD P. CHEYNEY	121
Dr E. W. LYTTLE	124
Dr HENRY E. SHEPHARD	124
Prof. J. B. CARTER	125
Prof. CHARLES N. COBB	126
Prof. SIDNEY T. MORELAND	126
MISS ELEANOR L. LORD,	126
Miscellaneous business	127
List of members 1902-3	131
Delegates registered 1902	134
Officers in previous years	137
Officers for 1902-3	140
Publication of the association 1902	141
Index	143

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION 1902-3

President

Pres. IRA REMSEN, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Md.

Vice presidents

Prin. LOUISE SHEFFIELD BROWNELL SAUNDERS, Balliol School, Utica N.Y.

Dr S. J. MCPHERSON, Lawrenceville (N.J.) School

Pres. JAMES D. MOFFATT, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington Pa.

Prin. A. H. BERLIN, Wilmington (Del.) High School

Pres. FRANCIS A. SOPER, Baltimore (Md.) City College

Secretary

Dr HERMAN V. AMES, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Treasurer

Prof. JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa.

Executive committee

President, secretary and treasurer ex officio

WILSON FARRAND, Newark (N.J.) Academy

JAMES RUSSELL PARSONS JR, University of the State of New York, Albany N.Y.

Prof. LOUIS BEVIER JR, Rutgers College, New Brunswick N.J.

Prof. EDWARD EVERETT HALE JR, Union College, Schenectady N.Y.

Proceedings of the 16th Annual Convention

OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES

AND

PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

OF THE

MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

Held at Johns Hopkins University and the Woman's College, Baltimore Md.,
Nov. 28-29, 1902

SUMMARY OF SESSIONS

1st session, Friday, Nov. 28, 10.30 a. m.

Meeting called to order by Head Master WILSON FARRAND

Address of welcome

President IRA REMSEN, Johns Hopkins University

Response

Head Master WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy

Should Admission to Colleges be by Examination or by
Certificate?

Educational Value of Examinations as the Culmination of the
Preparatory Course

Dean JAMES E. RUSSELL, Teachers College, New York

Methods in Use of Accrediting Schools

Professor A. S. WHITNEY, University of Michigan

Effect of College Entrance Examinations on the Secondary
Schools

Miss JANE L. BROWNELL, Miss Baldwin's School, Bryn Mawr

Dr JULIUS SACHS, Sachs Collegiate Institute, New York

Discussion

Professor LIGHTNER WITMER, University of Pennsylvania

President JOSEPH SWAIN, Swarthmore College

Dr JAMES M. GREEN, State Model School, Trenton

Professor LOUIS BEVIER JR, Rutgers College

Dr HENRY L. TAYLOR, University of the State of New York

Dean JAMES E. RUSSELL, Teachers College, New York

2d session, Friday, Nov. 28, 2.30 p. m.

Report of the College Entrance Examination Board

Professor THOMAS S. FISKE, Columbia University

Report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements in English

Professor FRANCIS H. STODDARD, New York University

Relative Functions and Powers of President, Trustees and Faculty

The President

President IRA REMSEN, Johns Hopkins University

The Trustees

Dr SIMON J. MCPHERSON, Lawrenceville School.

The Faculty

Professor GEORGE S. FULLERTON, University of Pennsylvania

Discussion

Dr JAMES H. CANFIELD, Columbia University

President JAMES M. TAYLOR, Vassar College

Dean T. F. CRANE, Cornell University

3d session, Friday, Nov. 28, 8 p.m.

President's address: Existing Relations between School and College

Head Master WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy

4th session, Saturday, Nov. 29, 10 a. m.

How should the Entrance Examination Paper in History be Constructed?

Professor LUCY M. SALMON, Vassar College

Dr JAMES SULLIVAN, New York High School of Commerce

Discussion

Professor EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, University of Pennsylvania

Professor PAUL VAN DYKE, Princeton University

Dr EUGENE W. LYTTLE, University of the State of New York

Dr HENRY E. SHEPARD, Baltimore

Dr JULIUS SACHS, Sachs Collegiate Institute, New York

Professor J. B. CARTER, Princeton University

Professor CHARLES N. COBB, University of the State of New York

Professor SIDNEY T. MORELAND, McDonogh School

Miss ELEANOR L. LORD, Woman's College

Miscellaneous business

Election of officers

Adjourned

PROCEEDINGS

Friday morning, November 28

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

BY PRESIDENT IRA REMSEN, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Association: I remember very well the last time this association met in Baltimore. It was in 1894, eight years ago. At that time the association was quite young. Having been born in 1887, it was but 7 years of age. It is now 15. I have not seen much of you for the seven or eight years that have elapsed since then, and, as I look on you, I am tempted to exclaim, How you have grown! It is evident that the association has served a useful purpose. It would be entirely out of the question to bring together so large a number of teachers unless the meetings were serving some useful purpose. What is this purpose? I think it is the bringing together of those who are carrying on work in the preparatory schools and those who are carrying on work in the colleges. It is most desirable that the teachers in the schools and the teachers in the colleges should come together as often as possible, so that they may learn to know and to understand one another. The colleges sometimes complain of the work done by the preparatory schools, and I am sure the preparatory schools often complain of the requirements of the colleges. I must confess that my sympathies are with the schools. If the work of the colleges were subjected to the same kind of scrutiny as that to which the work of the schools is subjected, I am inclined to think that there would be occasion for at least as much criticism as we sometimes indulge in in speaking of school work.

I am glad to welcome you to Baltimore, and I am specially glad to welcome you as guests of the Johns Hopkins University. I also want to say on the part of the Woman's College that this college has claimed part of your time, and there has been some friendly discussion between us over the division of your time. You are to go there tonight, but will hold your meetings this afternoon and tomorrow in this place. The address of your president is to be delivered there. This is to be followed by a reception by the Woman's College. Tomorrow you come back to us

again, and will have a session here, adjourning, finally, about noon. That is the program in brief.

You are now in the main assembly hall of the Johns Hopkins University. The University is not celebrated for its architecture or beautiful buildings, or anything else that is pleasing to the eye, but, if you can find time, and I hope you will be able to do so, to look around the university buildings, you will find that, in spite of the plainness of the structures, they contain all that is necessary or desirable for work. If you can visit the libraries and laboratories, you will find things of interest to you; things which will give you some idea of the way we are working here. In spite of all the doleful tales in regard to the financial condition of the Johns Hopkins University, the work has been carried on without interruption, and we have everything necessary for carrying on this work — apparatus and books. We have been obliged to struggle for some time against adversity, and have been hoping that something might turn up. Something has turned up. Important gifts came to us last year, and these have put us all in a cheerful mood. You come at an opportune time. In order to visit our libraries and laboratories, you will not have to do much walking. All our buildings are within a very small compass, except the buildings of the medical school, which are some distance away. All the others are within a stone's throw of one another.

When you next come to Baltimore, I hope we may be able to receive you in our new home, which has the attractive and suggestive name "Homewood." Since the developments of last year I may exclaim, "We are but pilgrims here," Homewood "is our home!" I often walk out to our new home, and have great pleasure in thinking of the time when we shall be able to move. When I say that I hope we may see you in this new home when next you meet here, I do not mean to suggest that you are not to come again soon. The implication is that we shall be in this home before many years have past. There I hope it may be my privilege to receive you, and I can assure you that the surroundings will be much more attractive than they are here. We shall specially be free from cobblestones and trolley cars.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is not expected of me that I shall take much of your time this morning. As I have already said, the

buildings and rooms are all open for your inspection. I welcome you again to the city of Baltimore and as guests of the Johns Hopkins University, and I venture to express the hope that your deliberations may be as profitable on this occasion as they have been in the past.

Response

BY HEAD MASTER WILSON FARRAND, NEWARK ACADEMY

President Remsen, Ladies and Gentlemen: As I rise to respond to the graceful and hospitable welcome of President Remsen, I am reminded of the clergyman who, when asked to say grace, was accustomed to cast an inventorial eye over the board and to vary his grace according to what he saw in prospect. We probably all agree that this is an occasion for bringing out our best grace.

Those of us who attended the previous meeting of this association in Baltimore do not need to have their anticipations whetted; and even with those who have never been here before the reputation of southern hospitality and of Baltimore gastronomy are sufficient to let them know what is in store for them. The wisdom of this association's imperialistic action in forcibly annexing Maryland to the Middle States is amply justified, if for no other reason, by the fact that it gives us an opportunity every few years to meet in Baltimore.

But while the social side of our meetings is prominent, and while a large part of the value of the association comes from the opportunity it affords for personal intercourse, we have a more serious purpose, and it is an inspiration to meet in this university which during its brief life has won for itself such a high place and has exerted so profound an influence on higher education in this country. When, in addition to this, we consider the sister institution which joins Johns Hopkins in hospitality, and the other educational institutions of this city, and when we consider the men who have done so much to further the work in which this association is engaged — I need mention no other names in this connection, President Remsen, than those of your distinguished predecessor and his worthy successor — when, I say, we consider all of these, we feel that, as was said in olden times, "it is well for us to be here."

Admission to college We thank you, sir, for your cordial welcome; we shall endeavor to show our appreciation of your hospitality in a more practical manner during these two days; and we trust that, when we have departed, Johns Hopkins University, the Woman's College, and the city of Baltimore will have no occasion to regret this northern invasion of Maryland.

SHOULD ADMISSION TO COLLEGES BE BY EXAMINATION OR BY CERTIFICATE?

EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF EXAMINATIONS AS THE CULMINATION OF THE PREPARATORY COURSE

BY DEAN JAMES E. RUSSELL, TEACHERS COLLEGE, NEW YORK

Examinations are presumably means to an end, not an end in themselves. In everyday life the wise man looks before he leaps; he considers the ground before he chooses the path he will follow; he tests the goods before he makes his purchase; he tries his acquaintances before he makes his friends. The extent and thoroughness of the examination in everyday life, depend, however, on supply and demand. When I must have something to eat and the visible supply is sadly deficient, the examination of what is put before me is conducted with little appeal to sense or reason, or perhaps omitted altogether. When I go a fishing, my experience is that the examination of my catch is appreciative rather than critical, and, I must confess, oftentimes contrary to good judgment, if not actually at variance with legal requirements.

There can be no doubt of the educational value of examinations, to those who conduct the examinations. Our daily experience shows conclusively enough that success in life depends largely on the critical acumen which precedes and influences judgment. Perhaps this is one reason (it is hardly becoming in me to make the suggestion) why colleges cling so tenaciously to the privilege of examining candidates for admission.

But, seriously, it is good for a boy occasionally to have to pass formal examinations. He may some day want to be a civil servant — a policeman, a street-sweeper, or a teacher (this is not intended to be an anticlimax), and then he will be required to come to terms with a list of questions and an examining board. Moreover, he will have frequent use in life for the ability to con-

ceal his own ignorance. And when we consider, in the words of Admission to college Richard Baxter, "how very little it is that we know in comparison to that we are ignorant of," it will be seen that the ability to veneer this vast body of ignorance with a respectable coating of usable information is an accomplishment not lightly to be regarded. It might also be mentioned in this appreciation of the educational value of examinations (for those who are examined), that there is nothing more likely to take the conceit out of a fellow than a try at a paper set by persons whom he doesn't know in a subject which he thinks he does know. As a modern philosopher has remarked, "a reasonable amount of fleas is good for a dog — they keep him f'm broodin' on bein' a dog."

The topic assigned me, as I understand it, excludes the consideration of examinations given in the course of instruction for the purpose of making that instruction more efficient. Such tests as written recitations, quizzes, term and final examinations and the like are of the greatest value to the teacher who is really concerned in educating his pupils. These examinations are indispensable; they need no argument to justify the position they hold in our scheme of instruction. But examinations conducted by outside authorities are in another category. They, too, may have a place and be valuable, but the justification must come from some other source.

From the standpoint of the pupil, examinations conducted by persons outside the school are far and away more harmful than helpful. I grant that they do tend to keep lazy boys up to the scratch, to show the conceited how little they know, to train the nervous and scatter-brained to hold themselves in and do something on time — in short, they do help a boy to pull himself together and concentrate himself on a task which requires all his strength and ingenuity. But what is it all worth in comparison with the attendant evils? The tendency to substitute for high ideals in scholarship a mere caricature of learning, to put forward a mechanical process as the *summum bonum* of the school course, to replace clear thinking by guesswork, to regard the examiner as a person to be satisfied at any cost, honestly, if possible, dishonestly, if necessary. Any scheme that puts a premium on success at a particular time or under peculiar conditions,

Admission to college strains the moral fiber. It is certainly good for moral fiber to withstand a strain; but, when for sake of reward or fear of failure, the strain becomes unendurable, the result is altogether bad. The recent experience of an eastern preparatory school is by no means exceptional, save in the extent of the fault and the publicity given to it. The relation between candidate and examiner does not promote high moral standards; witness the need of proctors and the unwillingness of boys, even college students, to assume the moral responsibility of taking examinations without watchers. The overseers of a New England college (Tufts) have recently published the following criticism of prevailing student customs:

It is well understood that the student body in most colleges has always sanctioned a highly artificial code of morals which thoughtful men would repudiate at once in the domain of business or of society. This peculiar code, which tolerates cheating in examinations, justifies the destruction of private property in the celebration of athletic victories, encourages boorish manners, and various forms of reprehensible conduct and causes strained relations between professors and students, was perhaps a natural outgrowth of the inflexible curriculum and the paternal form of college government which prevailed until comparatively recent years.

The situation is a relic of that educational barbarism which assumed no honesty in the scholar and no sympathy in the master.

On this point, therefore, let there be no misunderstanding: To the boy who is examined by outside authorities for the sake of personal gain, there can be no benefit worth mentioning which can not be secured equally well in some less reprehensible way, but, on the contrary, the process tends to lower our intellectual and moral standards, a fact which, through long familiarity, we have come to minimize or entirely to disregard.

But, as I have said, there is a place for examinations, and in that place they have a distinct value. Outside examinations are imperative whenever the secondary schools are unable or unwilling to assume the responsibility of meeting the requirements for admission to colleges and universities. If good work is to be done in our colleges and professional schools, a suitable foundation must be laid in the field of secondary education. If the

secondary schools will not or can not assure the strength of that ^{Admission to college} foundation, then it is imperative that the higher institutions impose their own tests. Weak schools, of course, may be left out of consideration. But why, it may be asked, should any secondary school refuse to certify to the strength of its candidates, if it is capable of doing so? Several reasons at once suggest themselves: lack of knowledge of what the higher education really demands, modesty in proclaiming one's own belief, unwillingness to be tacitly responsible for work over which one has no control, inability to withstand the importunity of ambitious parents, adherence to collegiate customs, and so on through a long catalogue. We have all heard them many times and in many forms, varying from the modest excuse to the utterly imbecile apology.

So trivial do some of the reasons seem and so out of harmony with the character of the men who put them forth that I have concluded to look deeper for the true cause of the apparent unwillingness of certain secondary schoolmasters to stand sponsor for their scholars. When the principal of a large high school tells me that he has more important work to do than to satisfy the crotchets of some college professor, I can see an obvious reason for his position; but, when the master of a school avowedly preparatory to college and well assured of the patronage, tells me that he prefers outside judgment as to who of his pupils shall go to college, I am at a loss to understand his meaning without appeal to first principles.

The great public schools of England—Eton, Harrow, Rugby and the rest—have long been ideal fitting schools. Their ideal is, I need hardly say, out and out English; it is not French; it is not German; it is not American, but it is a type which finds sympathy and support everywhere.

An Englishman, high in the councils of the government, has recently said:¹

We have never made an idol of intellectual instruction imparted in day schools. In other words, our great educators have upheld the belief (though we are far from having lived up to all that the belief implies) that a school ought to be something higher than a knowledge factory; that what a man *is* matters a great

¹ Dr Sadler. Special Reports, 9:9.

Admission to college deal more than what he *knows*; that wise actions involve many vital elements besides intellectual attainments; and that education, in the true sense of the word, is an atmosphere and a discipline affecting heart and mind and body, and neglecting none of the three.

Again he says:²

We are in the habit of liking our national life to be so arranged as to allow as much freedom as possible for every gifted individual to express himself according to his inborn faculty. This means that we prefer untidy freedom to an immaculately neat system of restraints. We resent the idea of pressing boys or girls to learn a great deal at school. We believe in the value of a good deal of well employed idleness during early years.

In other words, the master has much more to do in school than to give instruction, and for the boy there is a larger and more important life than the life of the classroom. Kipling portrays that life most admirably in *The Brushwood Boy*:

Ten years at an English school do not encourage dreaming. Georgie won his growth and chest measurement, and a few other things which did not appear in the bills, under a system of cricket, football and paper chases, from four to five days a week, which provided for three lawful cuts of a ground ash if any boy absented himself from these entertainments . . . At last he blossomed into full glory as head of the school, ex officio captain of the games, head of his house, where he and his lieutenants preserved discipline and decency among 70 boys from 12 to 17; general arbiter in the quarrels which spring up among the touchy sixth—and intimate friend and ally of the head himself. . . Above all, he was responsible for that thing called the tone of the school, and few realize with what passionate devotion a certain type of boy throws himself into this work. Home was a far away country, full of ponies and fishing and shooting, and men visitors who interfered with one's plans; but school was the real world where things of vital importance happened, and crises arose that must be dealt with promptly and quietly . . . and Georgie was glad to be back in authority when the holidays ended. Behind him, but not too near, was the wise and temperate head, now suggesting the wisdom of the serpent, now counseling the mildness of the dove; leading him on to see, more by half hints than by any direct word, how boys and men are all of a piece, and how he who can handle the one will assuredly in time control the other.

1 Dr Sadler. Special Reports, 9: 501.

For the rest, the school was not encouraged to dwell on its ^{Admission to college} emotions, but rather to keep in hard condition, to avoid false quantities, and to enter the army direct, without the help of the expensive London crammer, under whose roof young blood learns too much. Cotter, *Major*, went the way of hundreds before him. The head gave him six months' final polish, taught him what kind of answers best please a certain kind of examiners, and handed him over to the properly constituted authorities, who passed him into Sandhurst. He did not know that he bore with him from school and college a character worth much fine gold, but was pleased to find his mess so kindly. He had plenty of money of his own; his training had set the public school mask upon his face, and had taught him how many were the "things no fellow can do." By virtue of the same training he kept his pores open and his mouth shut.

This little sketch of Kipling's is, I believe, the best portrait of the English public school in existence. He puts duty, common sense, character, in the foreground, as the great ends to be desired in education. Hence, his *Praise of Famous Men*:

And we all praise famous men—
Ancients of the college;
For they taught us common sense—
Tried to teach us common sense,
Which is more than knowledge.
This we learned from famous men,
Knowing not its uses
When they showed in daily work
Man must finish off his work—
Right or wrong his daily work—
And without excuses.
This we learned from famous men
Teaching in our borders,
Who declared it was the best,
Safest, easiest and the best,—
Expeditious, wise and best,—
To obey your orders.
This we learned from famous men,
Knowing not we learned it,
Only, as the years went by—
Lonely, as the years went by—
Far from help as the years went by,
Plainer we discerned it.
Wherefore praise we famous men
From whose bays we borrow—
They that put aside Today—
All the joys of their Today—
And with toil of their Today—
Bought for us Tomorrow.

Admission to college

Such an ideal of education as this demands, indeed, famous men as teachers. They are men who can not be harnessed to a system or hampered by restraints. The master is the school, and because masters differ, the schools will not conform to an accepted norm. A few succeed; others overreach themselves and are lamentable failures. Under such a system intellectual attainment ranks as one aim among many, and it is conceivable that it may not always be the most important one. Strength of character, honesty, integrity, physical prowess, the ability to lead one's fellows, can not be relegated to second rank in any system of education. Moreover, the intimacy between master and scholar in a good home school—an intimacy which, in the course of years, ripens into an affection that is akin to parental love—makes it extremely difficult for the teacher to judge the boy from one standpoint only. He knows him too well; his faults and his virtues are spread before him in an open book. To single out one attainment on which to predict the future is to neglect others which will surely tell as time goes on. How can the master, under such conditions, be a righteous judge? So it happens that, in such a system of education, examinations conducted by higher authorities come easily and naturally to be the culmination of the school course.

Say what we will about the English school system, we Americans do believe in the best ideals of English education. There is something in *Tom Brown's School Days* which thrills us as schoolmasters even more than when we were schoolboys. We are ready to say, and we generally mean it, that what a man *is* is of far more consequence than what he *knows*. We believe that the making of men is the chief end of school work, and we are not unwilling to borrow methods from those who seem to be successful in making a certain type of Englishman.

But notwithstanding our admiration for some things in English education, we can not accept all that the system implies: class distinctions; "boarding schools for those who are to be leaders in church and state, day schools of an inferior sort for the masses"; separation of the sexes whenever possible; interference of a state church; low ideals of scholarship. Some of these we

regard as not so much a fault of English education as of English ^{Admission to college} life, but bad teaching is certainly the work of poor teachers.

It has been remarked that, in judging a teacher, the German asks, What does he know? the American, What can he do? the Englishman, Is he a good fellow? Dr Sadler, whose office in England corresponds to that of Dr Harris in this country, says on this point:¹

No schoolmasters in the world lavish more time and thought and strength on the care of their pupils than the English secondary schoolmasters. On what may be called the pastoral side of this office, they are beyond rivalry. . . . But, because the English secondary schoolmaster so often lives among his pupils from morning to night, he has far less time and strength to spare for professional studies than has his continental counterpart. He is much more the friend of his pupils, and much fresher in his sympathies with the interests of young people. But he is far less of a student; as a rule, is much less learned; and is often a hardened amateur in his methods of teaching. . . . Clumsy, antiquated methods of instruction are far too common in our secondary schools.

For the remedy, he points his countrymen to Germany and extols German scholarship and German thoroughness. He says:

The Germans have succeeded in getting a much larger proportion of their people to go through an advanced course of instruction than is the case in England. . . . They have managed to inculcate scientific habits of mind and a disposition towards intellectual organization and cooperation to a degree quite unparalleled here. . . . They have skilfully applied education as an instrument in furthering their commercial and industrial interests. . . . We shall find ourselves virtually compelled by their action to replace much of our old educational machinery by something which works more economically and turns out a more modern fabric. . . . ²The strength of German education lies in its great tradition of disinterested devotion to knowledge, in the self-sacrificing labours of the teachers . . . and in the infinite capacity for taking pains, which (whether innate or the result of a long tradition of educational discipline) is characteristic of so many German minds.³

"The German schools," he points out, "could never have become what they are today, had it not been for the high intellectual

1 Special Reports, 9:10-11.

2 " 9:35.

3 " 9:71.

Admission to college qualifications of the teachers, and for the care taken to weed out those who are lacking in professional aptitude for the work of teaching." It is for an intellectual tradition, as persistent and congenial as the ethical tradition which characterizes the best English education, that Dr Sadler pleads.¹

The development of individual intelligence is largely a question of methods of teaching, but also of choice of studies. Educational efficiency of the best kind depends on having small classes, highly trained teachers, skilful methods of teaching, not too many subjects, the right order of subjects, the right choice of subjects, and the avoidance of hurry, of excessive competition and of intellectual overstrain. . . . The keen study of methods by teachers is one of the best signs of educational progress. But the aim should be, not to enable the pupil to win a prize or a scholarship by a certain time, or to pass in some competitive examination (though I am far from meaning to imply that all competition is bad, or that all examinations could be dispensed with), but to start him in the right way of learning things for himself, to arouse his interest in important subjects, and to give him a sure foundation of accurate and well directed knowledge. Large numbers of our secondary schools are worried by a superfluity of examinations. It would be far better to have some well defined intellectual aim for each school, and to allow the teachers to work steadily and quietly towards that aim.

I have quoted thus at length from a high English authority, to show how conscious some Englishmen are of the great defects in English education. His verdict is, in a word, (1) low ideals of scholarship and (2) bad teaching. Both lead naturally and inevitably to the curse of examinations, systemized and conducted by authority of the state or university.

Little wonder that the Englishman, in seeking for light, should turn to Germany. German education is strong precisely where English education is weak. The one system lacks just what the other can give. All the world knows what German universities stand for: investigation, research, pure scholarship. But the German secondary school is the foundation on which the German university stands. It has its own intellectual traditions and points to a long line of scholarly schoolmasters, the finest classroom teachers in the world. Here are blended the scholarly at-

¹ Special Reports, 9: 163, 164.

tainments and skill in teaching which the Englishman and the American must admire and ought to covet. No lecturing or hearing recitations in a German school; the teacher is there to instruct. And instruction means to the pupil the acquisition of useful information — knowledge systemized and directed toward some end which is itself worthy of attainment. Hence the German teacher points out the way; the pupil follows his instructions confidently, knowing that there is no better way. The work in class day by day is not guesswork; there is no dawdling over lessons out of school, no juggling with problems in mathematics or thumbing of lexicons to make sense out of a foreign language exercise. The teacher has a purpose, and that purpose is to see to it that his pupils learn what for the time being is most important for them to know.

With teachers who know what to teach and how and when to teach it, there is no need for formal examinations to decide the matter of promotion or graduation. At the end of each year, the class teachers, in a German secondary school, determine who in their opinion are qualified to do the work of the next higher class, and at the end of the course, candidates for the university are passed on or held back by verdict of the teachers of the highest class. There is a final examination, to be sure, conducted under the supervision of a state official; but the questions are set by the teachers of the candidates on the work of the preceding year, and the results are weighed and estimated by these same teachers. But so nicely is part adjusted to part in this great system that there is likely to be no greater variation in the attainments of boys coming up to the universities from different schools, than of those coming from any particular school.

Say what we will of the German school system — of its inflexibility, its subserviency to state control, its military character — we Americans do admire its adherence to high ideals of scholarship, its appreciation of the teacher's profession and its success in methods of teaching. We recognize that it is a piece of finely adjusted machinery, and that in the attainment of German aims, better means could hardly be devised. We have shown our appreciation in enduring forms; Andrew D. White says that, intel-

Admission to college lectually, Germany is the second mother of the United States.¹

"More than any other country, Germany has made the universities and technical high schools of America what they now are—a powerful force in the development of American civilization." It is German influence, too, working in the realm of higher education, which has propounded to the secondary schools some of the most vexing questions of the past decade.

We Americans are, as Kipling puts it, "mixed peoples with all the vices of men and boys combined." But along with the vices go virtues, which our schoolmasters must steadily keep to the front. We may be ethically English, intellectually German, but we are naturally—if accidentally—American. We believe in the doctrine of equal opportunity for all men, and for every boy and girl who can use it, we believe in an educational ladder reaching from the kindergarten to the university. That ideal at least is not English and it is certainly not German. We believe in helping each pupil to make the most of his opportunities and to become that which he wishes to be, providing his aim is not too obviously harmful to his fellows. We set up no barriers, social or otherwise, to hamper his progress, and we never regard his career as ended till he is safely under ground. There is no "culmination" in American life short of death itself. Our school system, therefore, if it is to fit for American life, can have no bounds. We have no right to speak of the "culmination" of a school course, unless we mean thereby in college parlance a "commencement." And least of all should we think of examinations as the culmination of anything educational.

Let us reason together about this thing, this relic of educational barbarism. It comes to us with the English stamp not yet effaced; it bespeaks a tradition of poor scholarship and bad teaching. It is enforced by institutions which are more than half "made in Germany," but which are complacent enough to suppose that German scholarship can be erected on a secondary education, the sole guaranty of which is an examination for college entrance, or in lieu thereof, as was once remarked in a meeting of this association, "the good looks of the candidate." Is it not

¹ London Times, Dec. 1, 1900, quoted in *Special Reports*, 9:37.

more reasonable to suppose that, when we succeed in evolving ^{Admission to college} an American system of education — really American, I mean, not a mere cross or hybrid — it will be a unity? a system necessarily made up of constituent parts, but so nicely adjusted that part will work with part in organic unison? When that time comes, I venture to predict we shall hear nothing of examination for admission to any grade or to any school, but much will be said of examinations for instruction and promotion. The elementary school will pass on its pupils into the secondary school, and the secondary school will admit them to college, if that be their proper aim. Or, more properly speaking, scholars who are let out of one grade or school will admit themselves to the grade or school next higher. Already we hear it said that graduates of any good four year high school course should find a college course open to them. I accept the statement and should be glad to add to it these words, "without examination by college authorities."

But before these words can be added, the American public must see to it that the high school course is really good, and that the teachers, in point of character, scholarship and professional ability, are really worthy of the positions they occupy and of the hire which they ought to have. In the meantime, it is our duty to be righteously discontent with our present schemes of state inspection, Regents examinations, college entrance boards and the like, knowing them all to be dispensations of Providence, calculated to keep us humble and fit us for a more blessed state. The millennium is not yet in sight, but the advance made in recent years in the matter of uniform entrance requirements, and specially in the establishment of the College Entrance Board is most gratifying. But, while we are waiting, let us be honest enough to confess that all these examination schemes are devices, as some say, to impress on a doubting world the great importance of certain indispensable institutions of higher learning, or the acknowledgment, as others declare, of the shortcomings of American secondary schools and the incapacity of American secondary schoolmasters.

Admission
to college**METHODS IN USE OF ACCREDITING SCHOOLS**

BY PROFESSOR A. S. WHITNEY, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[Read by the secretary]

The time allotted for consideration of this subject necessarily limits me to a brief presentation of its main essentials. It has been deemed best, therefore, to confine the scope of this paper to a concise exposition of the origin and progress of the accrediting system, the present methods of accrediting schools, the methods of certificating students, and the general evaluation of the system as conceived and executed primarily by the University of Michigan, supplementing it with reports of methods in use in other institutions whenever sufficient differentiation obtains to cause any material modifications of the plans evolved. I shall make no attempt to set the merits or the demerits of the accrediting system over against those of the examination system as operating within the territory covered by this association. To do so would be to transcend the bounds circumscribed by the topic assigned me.

The accrediting system had its origin at the University of Michigan in a resolution adopted by the faculty in 1871 and confirmed by the Board of Regents in 1872 — 30 years ago. It sprang from two apparently antagonistic causes: first, from an earnest desire on the part of the president and members of the faculty to cooperate with superintendents and principals of high schools with a view to consolidating, strengthening and elevating the entire system of the state; and secondly, from urgent solicitations of superintendents and principals of the leading high schools of the state for closer articulation with the university as an organic part of the educational system, to the end that each institution might react on and stimulate the other for the benefit of each and the good of the whole.

In the early beginnings of the accrediting system a committee of the faculty, on special invitation of superintendents and boards of education, annually visited the high schools and examined their courses of study, methods of instruction, scholarship of teachers and pupils, library and laboratory facilities, and prevailing intellectual and moral conditions. In addition, schedules

of test questions, previously prepared for use of visiting committees, were assigned the various classes, and their written answers submitted as confirmatory evidence of the character of the work accomplished. These findings were reported to the faculty, and on their character was determined the future relationship between each individual high school and the university. Admission to college

As time advanced and the number of schools seeking accredited relationship multiplied, this system was found burdensome and impracticable. The professors were too engrossed with their legitimate university duties to give sufficient time properly to conduct this work. In consequence, the formal test examination fell into disuse, and the term of affiliated relationship was gradually extended to two or three years according to the excellence of the school, the university always reserving the right to reexamine whenever, in its judgment, changed conditions might seem to warrant.

This system prevailed till three years ago, when stress of numbers, inadaptability of certain members of the faculty to the work of inspection, and a desire for greater uniformity of standards and methods necessitated a change. Following the example of several of her sister institutions, the University of Michigan appointed a special official to take sole charge of inspection and to report his findings to a so called diploma school committee composed of heads of departments with the president of the university as chairman. This plan of inspection now obtains, in some form or other, in connection with all the great universities of the Northwest except the universities of Minnesota and Indiana. The smaller institutions generally accept the standards set by the great universities of their respective states.

The University of Minnesota, as stated, has no special high school inspector as such, but it attains practically the same ends through the State High School Board, an organization created by the Legislature and endowed with certain specific powers and duties. This board appoints the state high school inspector, determines the methods of examination and standards of scholarship, and approves or disapproves the work of each individual high school according to the findings reported. If these findings are satisfactory, the high school is given a bonus of \$400 from

Admission to college the state treasury as an aid and stimulus to further endeavor and is placed on the accredited list. Students graduating from such approved schools are, if properly recommended, admitted without examination into all the higher institutions of the state, including the state university. That the standards set for the high schools are of a high order is attested by the fact that the president of the state university is ex officio chairman of the State High School Board.

In Indiana the methods of procedure are widely divergent from those already described. In that state the inspecting and accrediting function is performed solely by the State Board of Education, the different members of the board apportioning the work among themselves. Graduates from the high schools thus accredited, or "commissioned," are admitted without examination, when properly recommended, into the state university and all the other higher institutions of the state.

As stated above, therefore, the field work in connection with the great universities of the North Central states, with the exceptions named, is conducted at the present time by special inspectors. And, though representing different institutions, so systematic has the work become that the inspectors follow the same general methods of procedure, apply the same general principles of analysis, and seek the same general ends. Their methods differ somewhat in minor details, but not in essentials. The routine is practically as follows:

The inspector visits the schools without previous notification. He learns the population of the city, the total enrolment of the schools, the enrolment in the high school, and the number of teachers employed, both in the grades and in the high school. He acquaints himself with the teachers of the high school, inquires concerning their academic and professional preparation, the subjects they teach and the number and average length of their daily class periods. He visits the classrooms, analyzes the work of the teachers, and endeavors to determine the efficiency of each by noting his aim and plan of lesson, his mastery of the subject, his skill in adapting the lesson to the needs and capacities of his pupils, his ability to analyze and classify difficulties,

his power to attract and hold attention, his skill in the art of ^{Admission to college} questioning, his assignment of the lesson; he also notes the manner in which the pupils have attacked the lesson, their habits of thought and study, and the general spirit and progress of the class. He examines the course of study, the textbooks used, the library and laboratory facilities; he takes note of the plan of organization, the character and methods of discipline, and the intellectual and moral tone of the school; and he ascertains the average size of the graduating classes, the number of graduates attending higher institutions of learning, the number now preparing for such institutions, and the general attitude of the board of education, the patron, and the community toward the school and toward educational affairs generally. Finally, he examines the structure, capacity, heating, lighting and ventilating of school buildings.

All these facts and more are recorded by the inspector and reported back to the proper committee, or to the faculty, as a basis for determining what relationship should exist between the high school and the university. In case, however, it is a high school seeking a renewal of accredited relationship, this report is supplemented by official records showing the ability, or inability, of the students representing this high school to pursue university work with profit. If all the conditions essential to a school of high grade, as indicated by the inspector's report and by the scholarship of the students of this school attending the university, are present, the high school is formally approved and placed on the accredited list; if these conditions are wanting, the school is rejected, and the reasons therefor are specifically given to the proper authorities. It should be remarked in this connection, however, that some universities, notably Chicago and Illinois, follow the plan of accrediting by subjects, approving some and disapproving others; while the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa regard the high school as a unit, and accept it or reject it as such.

As to methods of certificating students to university authorities, there is much confusion and misunderstanding, specially among those unacquainted with the workings of the accrediting system. It is generally assumed that the possession of a diploma

Admission to college from an approved high school opens wide the doors of the university to all who may choose to enter. Such is far from the exact truth. At least four conditions must be fulfilled before an applicant can receive recognition at the hands of the university.

1 The applicant must have received his preparatory training in an accredited high school.

2 The applicant must be a graduate of an accredited high school. The university sets the stamp of its disapproval on non-high school graduates and will give them no recognition whatever. Only the finished high school product receives consideration.

3 The applicant must present a regulation certificate, furnished by the university and properly filled and signed by the superintendent or principal of high school; this certificate states that he has completed all the work required for entrance to the university and specifies the branches pursued, number of weeks and of recitations a week devoted to each, textbooks used, and the teachers' estimates of his scholarship in the several branches.

4 The applicant must furnish a recommendation from the superintendent, high school principal or faculty attesting belief in his ability to pursue university work with pleasure and profit to himself and credit to the university. The aim of this provision is manifestly to throw the responsibility for his success back on the high school, where it properly belongs. The school knows, on the one hand, all about the student, his powers, capabilities and impulses, and, on the other, all about the requirements of the university, and should, therefore, be able to judge accurately whether he is of university material.

It should be observed that after the first semiannual examination of the freshman year, the records of scholarship attained by the students thus recommended are reported back to their respective high schools, and the credit, or discredit, after making all due allowances for changed conditions, is charged accordingly. So deeply is this responsibility felt by high school authorities that they are wont to exaggerate on the side of conservatism. This is not only the testimony of superintendents and principals themselves, but it is demonstrated by the fact that every year

numbers of students who have been refused recommendations Admission to college by the accredited schools present themselves and enter the university by way of the examination door. This requirement has led not a few high school authorities to grade the diplomas granted to the graduating classes as "A" and "B," the former entitling the holder to certificates of admission to the university, and the latter withholding such privilege.

Having now briefly indicated the origin and early development of the accrediting system, the methods of accrediting schools, and the methods of certificating students to university authorities, there remains to ask what is the effect of this system on the university, on the high schools, and on the educational system of the state as a whole. From the standpoint of the University of Michigan, two features are worthy of consideration: first, the effect of the system on scholarship, and secondly, its effect on attendance.

As to scholarship, little better can be done than to summarize a report made by a committee of the faculty appointed to investigate the standings of students admitted on certificate as compared with those admitted on examination for the first nine years of the existence of the accrediting system. This committee made a careful study of the examination records of all the members of the freshmen classes for the period named and tabulated the results in such manner as to show separately the standings of those admitted on certificate and those admitted on examination, a study involving more than 1000 students and more than 10,000 examinations. The committee refrained from examining the records subsequent to the freshman year, in the belief that one year in the university ought to obliterate the main distinctions arising from differences in preparatory schools. From the tables thus framed and classified the committee computed the percentages of scholarship from each class by dividing the number of examinations successfully passed by the number that, by order of the faculty, ought to have been passed. The following are the results obtained:

Total number of students admitted on certificate.....	470
The percentage of scholarship.....	88.91
The total number of students admitted on examination..	574
The percentage of scholarship.....	87.22

Admission to college

It will be observed that the committee found a slight balance in favor of admission by certificate, showing that the university was the gainer, rather than the loser, by the change. Unfortunately no systematic investigations have been made since that time. It is our firm belief, however, that a like investigation today would not result to the disadvantage of the certificated student.

As to the effect of the certificate system on the attendance at the university, there is not the slightest doubt in the minds of any conversant with its workings that it greatly increases it. This is the unanimous verdict of high school and university authorities, of the students themselves, and of high school inspectors. It follows as a natural consequence from shortening and smoothing the pathway leading from the high school to the university and from bringing them into closer union and sympathy with each other. Two illustrations from many: A little more than a year ago the inspector responded to an invitation to examine the high school in the town of A. He was informed by the superintendent that there was no one preparing to enter higher institutions, and no sentiment for such preparation, but that he desired affiliated relationship with the university for the purpose of creating and arousing such an interest. The school was examined and accredited in the usual way. This very act seemed to arouse such ambitions and to open the door to such undreamed possibilities, that three students entered the university in the fall and others went elsewhere.

Somewhat less than a year ago the high school in the town of B was reexamined and rejected after having been on our accredited list for many years. Six students who were preparing to enter the university on certificate, were thus deprived of the privilege and could now enter only on examinations. Of these six one came and was successful; the other five sought institutions of lower grade. The school has now been reorganized and has made application for reexamination.

But it is from the standpoint of the high schools that the crowning virtue of the accrediting system is most marked, a fact wholly unrecognized and unappreciated by the great major-

ity of those unacquainted with the practical workings of the ^{Admission to college} system. It has been deemed best, therefore, to point out definitely and specifically wherein the accrediting system reflects on and exalts the high schools, even at the cost of overlapping and repetition.

1 Its influence on standards. Before a school can be accredited, it must offer all the branches required at the university for admission; it must pursue them for certain periods of time, the minimum of which is specified; it must give suitable opportunities for library and laboratory work; and it must attain a certain fixed degree of thoroughness, vitality and spirit of scholarship. The inspector comes, backed by all the authority and influence of a great university, examines these standards according to his definitely fixed ideals, and reports back to the proper authorities. On this report hangs in a large measure the reputation, the influence, and the prestige of the school, and therefore a favorable outcome is highly prized. Inspectors are frequently requested by superintendents to examine their schools unofficially for the sole purpose of aiding them in marking and bettering their standards.

2 Its influence on the teaching force. After the inspector has examined a high school, as heretofore outlined, comes the conference. Here he explains to the superintendent or principal the conditions as he sees them, commending the good and pointing out the bad. He explains the theories of the university, changes in requirements for admission, and plans in operation in the best high schools, and he suggests ways and means for correcting deficiencies and laying solid foundations for scholarship. He advises also concerning the organization, the methods of discipline, the courses of study, library and laboratory facilities, textbooks and supplies. The inspector listens, in turn, to a statement of their difficulties, fears, hopes and ambitions, and aids to the best of his ability in their proper solution. He meets the teachers, if need be, and gives them opportunity to ask for his criticisms, suggestions and help, an opportunity of which they freely avail themselves. If the standards of the school are only moderately satisfactory or are too low to warrant establish-

Admission to college ment of accredited relationship, it is placed on the "nursing list" and reexamined the following year. If conducted frankly and sympathetically, the conference hour can be made productive of immeasurable benefit.

3 Its influence on pupils. The influence of the accrediting system on pupils has already been indicated. There needs to be added, however, that the opening of the university door to all properly accredited students is not the only potent influence at work among them. The repeated visits of the university inspector are of scarcely less importance. They arouse among the pupils of the average high school a spirit of inquiry concerning colleges and universities; they set them to thinking and to talking about going to college; they intensify their desires and stimulate their ambitions to make the trial. The very fact that a great educational institution will send an official to them adds dignity, importance and seriousness of purpose to the work of the school and to the work of life. The pupils often ask questions concerning the university, the expenses of living, the opportunities for self-help, the methods of securing rooms and of registering. These the inspector answers individually, in groups, or in a short address before the school, offering suggestions, encouragement, help.

4 Its influence on the board of education and the communities. The boards of education and the communities always desire the highest possible efficiency of their schools, and they have come to measure this efficiency by the recognition the schools receive at the hands of the university. They therefore cordially invite the university inspector, earnestly seek his opinions and advice, and give serious consideration to all his recommendations. Indeed, so thoroughly have they come to rely on the university to mark the efficiency of their schools that I do not exaggerate when I say that there are few places in Michigan where a superintendent or high school principal can long maintain his position if accredited relationship, once established with the university, is repudiated on reexamination.

As to the effects of the accrediting system on the educational system of the state as a whole, I quote from the annual report

of President Angell to the Board of Regents, after an experiment ^{Admission to college} of 10 years. He says:

This innovation on old customs, like all innovations, and chiefly because it was an innovation, was met at once with severe criticism and especially by some distinguished educators in the older colleges; fearing, as was alleged, that such a system would bring down the standards of colleges. Experience however has proved that there was no ground for fear, except that the thing was new, and not practised in the mother colleges. Two facts are to be noted among the results: (1) the standard of preparation in the high schools, if affected at all, has been elevated rather than lowered; (2) the state system of education has become a reality. It is obvious that there can be no system, properly so called, without an actual and a living connection and communication among its members. By calling for the visiting or examining committee of the faculty, the high schools have been brought into that vital connection with the university which makes them parts of a natural organism and, so far as concerns our schools, our state system no longer exists merely on paper.

No one can look into the condition of these schools without feeling satisfied that this connection has had the effect both to animate their students to more earnest effort, and to encourage and strengthen the teachers; while it has brought about a more perfect unity of plan and method in the schools of the state in general. In short, it gives to our schools, otherwise isolated, a bond of union and a center of life. We are convinced, as the result of an experiment of 10 years, that this cooperative plan, especially if entered into by the few remaining schools, and thus perfected, will give a character of consistency, solidity, strength and efficiency to the educational work of the state, which will leave nothing further to be desired but the uninterrupted operation and movement of the system.

At that time there were 16 schools on the accredited list; today the number has swelled to 250. In a recent interview President Angell, in the light of the 20 years that have passed since that report was written, emphatically confirms the position there taken. He realizes that the accrediting system has its limitations, the same as the examination or any other system; but that, taken as a whole, it is freest from objections, is the most productive, and the most logical of all systems yet devised.

One criticism presents itself. The admission of properly accredited students to the university without examination tends

Admission to college to belittle examinations as an educational factor. This, however, is incidental rather than essential, and the university is gradually awakening to the necessity of setting the stamp of its disapproval on it.

In conclusion, permit me to say that the colleges and universities of a territory covered by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, are perfecting a plan looking toward a general recognition of the best high schools in the several states. When this plan is completed and put in execution, it will not be unlike this association in the breadth and uniformity of the work attempted.

EFFECT OF COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS ON THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Miss Jane L. Brownell—In spite of the argument of Dean Russell and the experience of Professor Whitney, I am obliged, because of my convictions, to take the other side of the question and to speak in favor of entrance to college by examination.

Dean Russell grants that, for the college, examinations are at present the best method of admitting students. I hold that for the schools also they are the best method.

I assume for the purposes of discussion the average good school, whether public high school or private day or boarding school, that prepares intelligently, under existing conditions, for entrance to college; also, the normal boy or girl, strong and healthy in body and mind. I take for granted also the college entrance examinations as they are now given, whether by the Uniform Entrance Examination Board or by individual colleges. However much the present examination papers may be capable of improvement, they are, on the whole, fair and reasonable tests of the work of the secondary schools.

Granted these premises, what is the effect of college entrance examinations on the secondary schools; and, if I may be allowed the corollary, is it possible to prepare students for college and an entrance examination and also, in the best sense of the word, to educate them? My contention is that, with a rational preparation, the effect of college entrance examinations on the secondary schools is good, and that, not only is it possible to prepare for

college and also to educate the student, but that the student that ^{Admission to college} is really well educated ought to be and will be the student that is best prepared for college.

Now I do not deny that examinations have their faults: that in some instances either the papers do little more than test the student's knowledge of facts or reflect some professor's pet theory; that the physical condition of the student often affects the quality of his answers, and that therefore a student may not be fairly tested by one day's work; that the dread of the examination sometimes injures a student's chance of passing; and that some, perhaps many, schools and teachers yield to the temptation of overworking their students in their anxious desire to fit them for the examinations. Only one of these, however—the occasional poor or unreasonable paper—is the fault of the college, and that can easily be remedied. Another, the physical condition of the student at the time of examination, must always remain a factor in the result. Temporary illness, however, will scarcely cause the failure of a well prepared student, though it may lower his grade. In all my experience, which has been almost entirely in girls schools, I have never known a student actually unable to take the examinations, or have I known one that has failed to enter college because of illness at the time of examinations. The other faults which perhaps are most often charged against the examination system are unnecessary and may, I believe, be entirely done away with if teachers, parents and students are sane and sensible.

Now the advantages to the secondary schools of college entrance examinations seem to me these: (1) the stimulus which the knowledge that the work of the school is to be tested by an outside authority gives to both students and teachers, specially to the latter, and, as a consequence, (2) the improvement in the quality of the preparation. I know of nothing that so holds a teacher up to his greatest effort as the certainty that his work is to be judged inevitably and inexorably by the results of the college entrance examinations. In the present day of sight translations and original demonstrations, the wise teacher teaches his students not to

Admission to college "cram," but to think; not to memorize, but to reason. The student that is so trained, finding that he can think and reason, gains confidence in his own powers, does not fear the unexpected, and, in fact, is interested and stimulated by the thought of wrestling with fresh problems set by others than his own teachers. This I know, by practical experience, to be true of some students. I believe that it might be true of many, if teachers did not get panic-stricken at times and, as it were, lose their good judgment, press their students hard toward the end of the course, and make them feel that everything depends on their learning a few more facts before the examination day, instead of making them feel that a clear head and the ability to use whatever brains they may have is the one thing necessary.

The statement that teachers need the stimulus of the college entrance examination is no reflection on the conscientiousness or the good intention of any teachers that are preparing students for admission to college by certificate. It is simply a recognition of the fact that it is inherent in human nature to work best under pressure; the pressure may be competition, or it may be, as in this case, an outside test, but it must be something.

Some may say that admission by certificate demands the same reviews and gives the same incentive to teachers. This, from the nature of the case, can not be true. The teacher, however impartial, must then judge of his work solely from his own point of view, from what *he thinks* the college wishes. He does not really *know* the college standard. From the very nature of secondary schools, the teacher's work year after year consists in a repetition of elementary principles; moreover, he parts with his students before they have made more than a mere beginning of knowledge; and unfortunately he himself seldom has time for advanced study of his own subject. How can he help but tend to lose his standard? It would be difficult to keep it even if he had obtained the degree of Ph. D., as have the teachers in the German secondary schools; but in this country, where the majority of teachers in the secondary schools have only the B. A. degree, and where many have not even that, it is practically impossible for the schools to keep the college standards. (3)

Under an examination requirement for entrance, the college ^{Admission to college} actually sets the standard for the schools. The examination papers are a definite and clear means of communication between the college and the school. Few of us who have been studying them have failed to read their meaning. (4) Furthermore, the college entrance examination relieves the schools of an unenviable responsibility. The pressure to give a certificate to a student who for good reasons perhaps may not be fully prepared for college, must often be very great—specially on the private schools. Moreover, there must often be times when, with no pressure except that of the teacher's personal interest in a student, his knowledge of the circumstances of the student's life and his belief that college life is the one thing that will develop what is best in the student, it is very difficult to make an impartial decision. For my part, I should prefer to be relieved of the responsibility, and would beg the college to decide which students it will take.

The moral effects of examinations on the pupil are of great importance. The boy or girl who has been trained, as I hope to prove that he can be, not to fear an examination, who, though he realizes that he has an important and difficult task before him, does not flinch, has learned lessons of self-control and courage that are more than worth the price paid.

The physical effects of examination are perhaps negative rather than positive. In other words, entrance examinations do not harm the average student in ordinarily good health. Moreover, they need not harm any student, provided he is properly prepared, without undue pressure or strain.

It is a great mistake to put so exaggerated an importance on college entrance examinations. They are very simple tests. Why can not they be looked on by teachers and parents, and consequently by students, as the fitting end of a preparatory course? The colleges do not wish to exclude all students from entering their doors—only those that are not well prepared or that have not the intellectual ability to do college work. All entrance papers then can undoubtedly be passed by even the student of ordinary intelligence that has been well prepared, or by the

Admission to college student of extraordinary intelligence that has not been well prepared. Others should not present themselves for admission to college, or, if they do, should take their failures philosophically and not cry out against examinations.

And now, if preparation for college need not prevent a good education, how may it be obtained? Only schools that give more than a mere preparation for the college examination, that is, that have their students with them for a comparatively long term of years, have the opportunity to try to accomplish both tasks. These include, however, any day school, public or private, and many boarding schools; that is, almost all the schools that prepare for college. They can have in the lower grades a wide and liberal course of educative work — work that trains both eye and hand. They should have plenty of color, drawing, manual training, and English, consecutive courses in history and elementary science and much French, less mathematics than is customary, and, later on, the ordinary amount of Latin, Greek or German. Thus they will give to their boys and girls a broad elementary education as well as preparation for college. For the last four years frequent short written lessons should be given, written in the proper form for future examination papers. During the last two years there should be thorough reviews, on which, however, no more time should be spent than on the preparation of a daily lesson, and short examinations, lasting not longer than an hour. Such a system of frequent written lessons and short examinations will make the student perfectly familiar with the act of taking examinations and will rid them of all their terrors. Most teachers know that mere strangeness is often the cause of fright. It may seem advisable to give for practice an occasional long examination, but not more than one of these should be allowed in each examination subject, and they should not be given later than the midyear. Everything possible should be done to lighten the pressure of work at the end of the year, to encourage the students and to give them confidence. Often a holiday of a day or two immediately before the first examination improves the physical condition.

Such then, very briefly sketched, is a rational preparation. I know by experience that it is both practicable and successful.

I hope that I have succeeded in proving both that it is possible Admission to college to prepare for college and an entrance examination, and at the same time to give the student a real education through a breadth of training in the lower grades; and also that the sequence of training implied is possible for almost all schools.

I hope too that I have proved that the injurious effects of examinations are not inherent in the system, but that they are due to an irrational preparation, and that therefore the evil effects are the fault of the schools and not of the examinations.

Dr Julius Sachs—The last speaker on a question so fully treated can hardly expect to make a startling contribution to the subject. He may perhaps discuss present conditions in the light of the future, i. e. from the standpoint of the ideal. What might be the effect of college entrance examinations on the secondary schools may serve to mark the contrast to "what is."

Your committee is wise; they have not asked about "Effect of Examination on Secondary *System* of Instruction." There could have been but one answer; it is ruinous. As long as college examinations are what they are, the uncertain, changeable device that wants one thing and states another, that makes its formulation conform now to one current of educational thought, now to another, they are antagonistic to the elaboration of a system of instruction. A system grows within itself, step by step; it does not sacrifice its logical development to fortuitous criticism exercised on a handful merely of those who have worked under it, specially since such criticism hinges on most unfavorable methods, employed at unfavorable times under unfavorable conditions. On secondary schools you do exert an influence; let us see whether it is wise. Your examinations profess to test the pupils, but you are constantly passing on the schools; as your scheme now operates, the schools have no alternative but to accept this inferential criticism; they must submit their pupils to your test; they know they are judged by your opinion, condemned by your opinion, and yet they can not evolve from your own statements a definite view of what you really want. Do you propose to apply the test, how the four years of secondary schooling have been spent? That calls for one kind of exami-

Admission to college nation; or are you anxious to establish a pupil's capacity, his power to do freshman work? That calls for an entirely different examination; and each one of the two examinations involves radically different processes of preparation, the one, endless reviews which are educationally of little value and deadening to the intellect; the other would permit steady, rational advance, each new step in advance fortifying the one previously attained. Yes, you do exert an effect on the secondary schools, one of constant unrest, constant dissatisfaction; we know that you can not gain at examinations the results you aim to secure; you are not able to make allowance for the exigencies of temperament and novelty of situation, and you put the stamp of your approval on those we should not approve, you find weak those whom we know to be strong. But your method forces us to repeat, each in his smaller sphere, during the whole course, the system of unwholesome excitement incidental to the examination scheme. If I am correctly informed, many college officers think that secondary men and schools need these warnings, this pressure. Perhaps so; certainly some of the entrance examinations remind one forcibly of punitive expeditions, undertaken periodically to curb rebellious hordes. If you state that you know of no other method to test the secondary schools satisfactorily than your entrance examination of the individual pupils, we shall have to ask you to take into consideration at least, the laws of human nature, and to remember that even your college students, two and three years older, are not forced during examination week to take three and four subjects a day; and again, that you can not expect an adolescent boy or girl to compass in two or two and a half hours a task that an expert specialist can hardly complete in the same time. These are not idle words; we of the Middle States have, it is true, escaped from the Babel of examinations of the individual colleges that reflected eccentricities quite as frequently as convictions; but we have found out one thing, that insight into the nature and possibilities of a secondary pupil is the rarest thing in a college professor; perhaps we have no right to demand it. Many were never interested in these things; others have lost the standard for measuring them; the result is the same.

We have made an immense gain by our examination board; we ^{Admission to college} can at least lay these facts before the examiners; we find it hard to convince at times, but we can put our fingers on the difficulty. They are at present thinking less of the beautiful examination papers that they have been wont to draw up; these papers are things of beauty in their scientific arrangement, their comprehensiveness; but of what avail all this beauty, if they ask the student to compass the impossible? From frequent recent contact with examining boards, I am free to say: nowhere are men more generous in intention, and yet how difficult in each concrete instance to convince them of the limitations of youth, with which we have become so completely familiar. We are far from an approach, even, to an ideal test; that would come only after college professors had frequently, and always with a very definite object, visited the schools. In the end they will know how to arrange a test, and will also know what kind of test will really prove the capacity of the pupils; but meanwhile they will probably have found it unnecessary; for by that time, somewhere this side of the millennium, they will have discovered that there can be another and better method to test the secondary schools and help them in the advancement of a secondary education. They may at some distant day gain the conviction that, where there is a corps of really good teachers and a good administrative head, there good work is done; and that such a school in its aim to maintain its high standing will not recommend inferior pupils to the college; they will also have detected poor teaching, inefficient teachers, and will recognize that from such surroundings no good material is likely to come to the colleges. They may arrive at the conclusion that the system of the accredited school, if thoroughly good and rigidly applied, would be a lasting boon to the whole of our educational system; that it would act as a spur to first-class teachers and first-class schools to establish a record and to maintain it year after year under constant inspection; that it would vastly increase the dignity of the secondary teaching profession — a highly accredited teacher would become a recognized factor in the community; an accredited school could not afford to deteriorate — it would maintain at all hazards a staff of com-

**Admission
to college**

petent teachers, or seek even to improve them. The first-class teacher and the first-class school should seek each other and be models for the growing ambitions of other schools. By the 21st century it might become clear from a careful study of the accredited school system, as practised in California, that it involves no organic difficulty that can not be overcome. True, there one university sets the pace, and all the schools must meet the demands of its examiners. But a council of the colleges and universities might create a body of inspectors, men of high educational ability, whose sole business it would be to inspect schools and school methods, secure annually lists of the teaching staff of each school that wishes to be accredited, inspect the schools at any time they chose and as often as they chose, ascertain the methods of discipline, of classroom work, the laboratory facilities and the mode of handling them, commend and criticize, but above all, ascertain whether the school's work warrants the acceptance of its judgment on the matter of entrance. A good school, a strong school in the eyes of the college authorities, these latter day professors will probably say, will also be strong enough to assert its standards, to refuse its approval of incompetent students. They will pronounce crude the examination of individuals; the proper inspection of institutions will appear to them a dignified procedure that every good school will welcome, and only weak schools will dread. Such a system of accredited schools would establish standards that every one would strive to reach, that no one could afford to forfeit, after the standard had been attained; each community would jealously watch over the maintenance of the privilege by its own schools, and would investigate closely the cause of any lapse. The standards of the teaching profession would be advanced in every respect. Our college friends will reach the bold conclusion that, when men's teaching is adjudged satisfactory, their judgment on the capacities of their pupils may also be considered acceptable; that, even if a good school were for a moment weak in its final decision on the qualifications of its students, the later record at college would bring out the fact and would endanger the continuance of the accrediting privilege.

From the beautiful possibilities of such a state of things in the ^{Admission to college} 21st century I am rudely awakened; objections countless assail me: a busy body of professors can not add to their many duties those of school inspection and supervision, can not afford to be withdrawn from their legitimate work; other methods of inspection are open to criticism of various kinds. Most strenuous is the objection from the financial side. I shall be told that the expense of such a system, if properly carried out, would be prohibitive; and yet President Wheeler of California pronounces no single item of expense at his university a more remunerative outlay than the thousands he spends on inspection. What, then, is to hinder at some future day, I mean a hundred years hence, the 10 most prominent universities of the Atlantic seaboard from arranging jointly a board of inspection that shall act in perpetuity and designate by their united authority and with the glad acclaim of all friends of secondary education the accredited schools of their section of the country? That would be the ideal outcome of the present system of college entrance examinations.

DISCUSSION

Prof. Lightner Witmer — The question, that has been so clearly and eloquently placed before us for discussion, appears to be: "Is it better for the colleges to examine and accredit preparatory schools or to examine and accredit individual applicants for admission?"

This question is capable of answer only on the basis of the results of the working out of the methods now in use of accrediting schools and of examining individual applicants. If the methods in use of accrediting schools have given practical satisfaction to the schools and the colleges, there would seem to be no question of the greater desirability of the colleges examining groups of applicants through the inspection of accredited schools in the stead of the traditional examining of the applicants individually.

Those of us, however, who have followed the papers that have just been presented, discover that both the schools and the colleges differ widely in opinion as to the relative merits of the two systems. My personal experience has not been such as to enable me to contribute facts that would materially assist in arriving

Admission to college at a proper conclusion as to the practical working of the system under discussion. I can only regret that my contribution today will necessarily be restricted to certain considerations as to the general value of examinations.

There is perhaps some reason for a few remarks on the general question of examination, as Professor Russell who contributed the opening paper, has gone for a solution of the question to fundamental principles and we hear in his and in other papers of arguments for and against examinations, and specially against examinations conducted by persons other than the instructors.

We hear, also, of the unendurable strain placed on the morals and physical health of the examinee and that the examination provokes unnecessary and injurious mental cramming in preparation.

There are no results that I am aware of, that show that an examination is too great a strain on the physical health of those who are at the time fit to stand a reasonable strain on their physical constitutions. An educational system should operate like life in general to eliminate the physically as well as the mentally unfit. The excessiveness of the moral strain is largely a matter of opinion. Naturally it is impossible for us to obtain statistics. I believe that boys and girls in the examination room exhibit as much candor and honesty as they do outside, and very much more than they will exhibit in the real struggle for existence when they attain to adult age. If an examination tests only the memory and not the real capacity of those examined, it is because the examiner has not learned properly to frame his questions.

It may be that a college is Mark Hopkins seated under a tree discoursing to a student. Probably we know what Mark Hopkins is, but we want chiefly to know what the student is getting from his association with Mark Hopkins. Does he for example get any more than the tree under which they both sit? How can we ascertain what the student is and does, or satisfactorily measure his capacities with those of others, except from what we learn about him as the result of a competitive examination? I think it must depend somewhat on the talent of the individual

instructor, and also to some extent on the subject taught, how ^{Admission to college} formal the examination shall be made, and whether the examination is best conducted by the instructor or one outside. Personally I object very strongly to examinations and have resorted to many devices to avoid the toil and expenditure of time necessary for the framing of questions and the examining of answers, but I am compelled from experience to place an ever increasing reliance on the examination, owing to its value to the average student.

In some subjects taught for admission to college, the examination may readily be dispensed with; for example, in the classics and mathematics. The classics are generally very much better taught than say, the modern languages and history. In the classics, we have fixed standards of requirement for each successive year. These standards have been developed under a system of examination. No one fails to understand what has thus been determined on as the standard requirement, through centuries of pedagogic adjustment, and dares to fall short of the standard. But we have no fixed standards in the modern languages and history. If a standard could be fixed and all schools could be made to adhere to it as they now do in the classics and mathematics, it would be very easy to do away with the entrance examination and admit a student on certificate, but when neither the colleges nor the preparatory schools know what they desire in history it would seem difficult to accredit schools on the basis of a general inspection.

In psychology, we have, also, no fixed standards at present of either college or graduate work. No one knows what psychology is, neither the public nor those who are giving instruction in this branch. I would very gladly submit my college and graduate students to an examination set by a competent number of say from three to six experts, whose function it should be, in making the test to which my students and others would submit, to determine and gradually raise the standards of requirement. I am sure this would help my work as an instructor at the University of Pennsylvania, and might render some not unnecessary service in forming ideals and stiffening requirements, even at other institutions.

Admission
to college

Pres. Joseph Swain — I wish to say only a word. It has been my fortune to be on the State Board of Education in Indiana for nine years, where the question of the method of entrance to college was a very important one. Personally I believe strongly in the certificate plan. I am not familiar enough with the schools in the states of this association to say however that the examination can be entirely discarded. I assume that here as elsewhere it is better to retain in part the examination system for those students coming from schools whose general standard is not known to be sufficient to be granted the certificate privilege.

The nine years' experience on the State Board of Indiana led me to believe that the secondary school should determine whether the student is prepared for college. After having visited a very large number of high schools, I see no more reason why the college professor should be the judge of the work in the high school than the teacher in the ninth grade should be the judge of the work in the eighth grade. The teacher of the eighth grade is the one to say whether the student is ready to go from the eighth to the ninth grade, and so it should be up the list till the student enters college.

The college must in some way determine the standard for entrance to college; and, when it has determined that much, it must by some suitable method determine what schools are prepared to fulfil this standard. The responsibility should then be placed on the secondary school. This privilege can be taken away from the secondary school, if its students fall below the standard set.

I am pleased to have presented here today the Michigan certificate plan. This plan or some modification of it has become almost universal in the colleges and universities of the West and Northwest, where it has been very satisfactory. I am glad to know that there is so much sentiment in this association for some such plan, and I feel certain that with the years we shall grow more and more in this direction.

Dr James M. Green — I think Dr Witmer in error if he understands the basis of this discussion to be on the merits of examinations as such. Examinations have a valuable place in class-

room work, and may there be conducted with benefit both to pupil ^{Admission to college} and teacher as class exercises to test the retentive and résumé powers of the pupil.

The question under consideration here is the relative value of an examination as a means of testing a student's fitness to enter college. It is in this office that the examination is inadequate.

A clergyman friend of mine preached one of his most eloquent sermons in which he illustrated by anecdote. After he reached his home, his little son asked him if what he had said in the pulpit was true. "What do you mean, my boy?" said he. "Do you suppose I would tell anything that was not true?" "Oh, I did not know but what you were just preaching," said the little son.

Are we entirely frank with ourselves and the evidence that comes to us or are we endeavoring to sustain pet theories?

Dr Witmer has referred to the examination as the only means of testing the student's capacity. Capacity is the very thing the examination does not test; it simply tests the power of memory.

Probably the best all-round student graduated from the New Jersey State Model School this year failed in his college entrance examinations, while weaker classmates passed. He simply met with the accidents of misfortune in the questions. Were I a college president with a thousand such students, I should think educational interests safe. He was a strong debater, a ready thinker, and had a good grasp of all the subjects of his course and was well prepared to carry the college work. Unfortunate in the particular questions of the examination and embarrassed, he failed to pass, and, there being no redress through supplementary information, he was obliged to spend another year in a preparatory school.

It is easy to say that, if pupils are well prepared, they are not disturbed by a college entrance examination, but the fact is that they are, for the reason that so much depends on it.

Miss Brownell herself in her paper favoring college entrance examinations has given us the best of evidence on this point. She acknowledges beginning definite training for the ordeal of examination two years before the pupil is to enter college.

How much better it would be to have the pupil spend his time in extending his scope in learning to include such essential

Admission to college branches as drawing, physical training, music etc., studies required of the public secondary school by the people, rather than in this mimic drill.

When pupils are to go up to the college entrance tests, they become nervous and their teachers become nervous. If the pupil should fail in the entrance examination, his ambition would be thwarted, and the school would get the reputation of being inefficient, hence the matter becomes one of frequent reference and constant concern, and the pupils are often brought into a state of mind that makes failure probable.

I myself have been connected for 12 years with a system of admitting students into a normal school on certificates from approved high schools, and it is my testimony that we find far less abuse from this system than from the examinations. There is no disposition on the part of teachers to abuse it, as the reputation of their schools depends on the success of their students after entering the normal. Furthermore, the normal is protected, as it can drop incompetent students. The same thing would doubtless be true with colleges.

Our educational system should be built on trust rather than suspicion. We hear much of "trusts" in other things; why should not we profit by this spirit? If students who have satisfactorily completed long courses in the secondary schools have their certificates honored, the secondary school men, nearly all of whom are college graduates, will in turn do all in their power to sustain the colleges by sending them well prepared students, and will find their schools freed from a great deal of unnecessary nervousness and occasional injustice.

If there are small, weak schools that wish to shield themselves from parental pressure by the college entrance examination, they might be permitted to do so.

Prof. Louis Bevier jr — I shall take but a minute of your time, as the hour set for the close of this discussion is at hand. I want to cite two facts which have come under my observation, to illustrate the effect of the college entrance examinations on the classroom work of the preparatory school, and on the individual student who faces them.

It has been my good fortune to be personally acquainted with ^{Admission to college} one of the best teachers of preparatory Greek in this country. His name is well known, and is a guaranty both of scholarship and of teaching ability. Yet even he can not escape from the influence of the college examinations which his pupils are to meet. He can not teach as he would with a free hand. He must teach with a view to the college entrance tests. His boys enter the largest institutions of the East, particularly Yale and Harvard, and they are remarkably successful in passing without conditions. His reputation is involved in seeing that they shall so pass.

Now, in Greek it is usual for the student to take his preliminaries one year and his finals the next. Generally, the Homer examination only is left for the last year, and this is largely concerned with the translation of the text of the *Iliad*, particularly of passages for "sight reading." A teacher would be either more or less than human if under these circumstances he did not teach in such a way as to meet the requirements. Accordingly the year's work consists in the rapid reading of the *Iliad* (and perhaps the Polyphemus story from the *Odyssey*), first the first three books, and then such passages from the later books as experience has shown are likely to be chosen for "sight reading." "You will take 60 lines here." "The next passage you may omit," "This book we will omit entirely except the last 100 lines," etc. The boys are coached on all the popular and favorite passages of the examiner, and are likely to "read at sight" most acceptably at the critical moment, unless by a divine mischance the passages chosen for "sight reading" really demand to be read at sight. The result is apt to be a boy who is a good guesser, and has a general facility in passing examinations, but whose knowledge of Greek is weaker indeed than it was at the end of the preceding year.

My second fact is an incident that occurred at the last September examinations in the institution which I represent. It presents vividly the mental attitude of the examinee and needs no amplification. A student was taking the English paper, on which one of the questions was: "Write four sentences illus-

Admission to college trating the use of the four modes of the verb." His answer was written as follows:

"I am trying the examination in English.

If I answer 10 questions, I shall pass.

I may pass, if I answer eight.

God help me!"

Dr Henry L. Taylor — [Question to Dean Russell] How do students admitted to Teachers College on certificate compare in classroom ability with students admitted to Columbia College on examination?

Dr Russell — I don't know that I can answer that question. There are so few pupils that enter the Teachers College on certificate that we have abolished the plan entirely, and are now wholly depending on the reports of entrance examination. To be sure, it is possible that some certificates have been accepted, but, where they were accepted, it was on a year's conditions; therefore, I have no way of knowing whether they are any better or not.

Dr Taylor — The presentation of the theme from Dean Russell's standpoint seems most accurate, clear and convincing. It was fitting that a representative from the University of Michigan should present the method of accrediting so extensively developed throughout the West through the influence of that university, but both wings are essential to sustain the flight of this fledgling. Examinations and accrediting are better than either alone, but, while the examinations of students and the accrediting of schools are factors in determining the ability of students to enter on advanced work, both have their limitations and their dangers. Moreover, the attention of this organization should be called to the fact that it is solving but one of the problems; namely, admission to colleges of liberal arts and science. A more extensive work is demanded in determining the relations to other superior institutions, e. g. for admission to medical schools or other professional and technical institutions.

Dr Sachs has enumerated the next important step in this development so clearly shown in New York's educational history.

There must be inspection of schools to determine their facilities and equipment. There must be contact with the student and teachers to examine intelligently. The limit of time precludes the discussion of the fourth essential. Report of
College
Entrance
Examina-
tion Board registration.

Friday afternoon, November 28

President Farrand — The executive committee has made some slight change from the regular program, and has decided to receive two reports before proceeding with the regular business of the convention; one is the report of the secretary of the College Entrance Examination Board, for 1902, and the other is the report of the committee of this association on college entrance requirements in English.

It seems desirable to have these reports made at this stage of the proceedings, so as to relieve the pressure sometimes incident to the business meeting which follows immediately after the last session.

REPORT OF THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD

BY PROF. THOMAS S. FISKE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The College Entrance Examination Board has to the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland the relation of child to parent. As you all know, the board grew out of a discussion which took place three years ago at the Trenton meeting of the association. In recognition of the relation that the board bears to the association, there has been incorporated in the constitution of the board an article whereby it is the duty of the secretary at each meeting of the association to render a report on the operations of the board. It is not necessary or appropriate, however, for me at this time to make to you an extensive and detailed report. It will perhaps be sufficient for me to call your attention to the fact that the operations of the past year have been described in detail in the recently published *Second Annual Report* of the secretary. Copies of that report have been sent to almost all of you, and there is here in this hall for distribution among such of you as may desire them, a supply of additional copies.

Report of
College
Entrance
Examina-
tion Board

It is perhaps a sufficient fulfilment of my duty to lay this report before the association and to present myself before you for the purpose of giving any information that may be desired, of answering any questions that may be put to me.

It appears to me, however, that I ought to bring to your attention one or two of the more remarkable points with respect to which the work of the board has progressed during the past year. The year has indeed been one of great progress. The whole number of candidates examined shows an increase of some 40% over the corresponding number of the preceding year. Considering only the number of candidates examined outside of the city of New York, the increase has been 100%. The number of institutions that have assumed an immediate responsibility for the work of the board has increased from 15 to 23. The very small number of institutions not accepting the results of the board's examinations has diminished and has become just one. The number of places at which examinations were held has increased from 69 to 130. The work of the board is rapidly assuming a national character. The membership of the board is no longer restricted to the Middle States and Maryland. It already includes three New England institutions—the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mount Holyoke College and Wellesley College, and one institution from the North Central states—the Case School of Applied Science. Many other institutions, specially in New England, have under consideration the question of applying for membership to the board.

In this connection again it is of interest to observe that the institutions which admit most of their students on certificate seem to be interested in the board's work equally with those which admit only on examination. This seems to me to be as it should be. A certificate system efficiently administered requires as an indispensable auxiliary an examination system. Candidates who come from schools the certificates of which are not accepted, candidates from accredited schools who are unable to obtain certificates, candidates prepared by private teachers, or whose preparation is in any way irregular, will always have to submit to examinations. I was greatly inter-

ested in the very important paper of Professor Whitney of the University of Michigan, which was presented at this morning's session. From this paper we learned that during a period of 10 years something like 1000 students were admitted to the collegiate department of that institution. Of this number a few under 500 were admitted on certificate and a few over 500 on examination. A careful examination of the records of the candidates shows that the scholarship of the candidates admitted on examination and the scholarship of the candidates admitted on certificate were, when expressed in percentages, almost exactly identical. This seems to me a very interesting result and it leads us to a number of important conclusions. First, I should say that it shows that by adopting a system of admission on certificate or a system of admission from accredited schools, a college or university is not enabled to dispense with examinations. Second, it shows that examinations efficiently administered afford a test of extraordinary reliability. We must remember that, in the case of the University of Michigan, almost all the best students from the best schools were admitted on certificate. To the examinations then was set the difficult task of determining which of the candidates not eligible for admission by certificate could safely be admitted. Apparently from this poorer lot of candidates the examinations made their selection so successfully that it was impossible to distinguish with respect to proficiency in their studies between those admitted on certificate and those admitted on examination. Under the circumstances that prevail in the West, this is an extraordinary tribute to the value of examinations; and I am strengthened in my belief that, whatever conditions prevail, whatever progress we make, a system of examinations properly administered will always be an indispensable instrument in the business of admitting students to college.

**Report of
commit-
tee on
entrance
require-
ments in
English**

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE ENTRANCE
REQUIREMENTS IN ENGLISH**

PRESENTED BY PROF. FRANCIS H. STODDARD, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

The committee on entrance requirements in English would respectfully report that a meeting for the revision and continuation of the list of books recommended for study in preparation for entrance examinations in English was held in New York city May 10, 1902, in the chancellor's room, New York University, Washington square. Each of the constituent bodies of the preceding conferences was represented by a single delegate, as follows: from the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, Prof. C. T. Winchester; from the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, Prof. F. H. Stoddard; from the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, Dr F. A. Hill; from the North Central Association of Teachers of English, Prof. F. N. Scott; from the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, Prof. G. R. Carpenter, *vice* Prof. W. P. Trent.

The meeting organized by appointing Professor Stoddard as chairman and Professor Carpenter as secretary.

It was recommended:

That the books set for reading and practice, for the years 1906, 1907 and 1908, be the following: Shakspere's *Merchant of Venice* and *Macbeth*; The "Sir Roger de Coverley Papers" in *The Spectator*; Irving's *Life of Goldsmith*; Coleridge's *The Ancient Mariner*; Scott's *Ivanhoe* and *The Lady of the Lake*; Tennyson's *Gareth and Lynette*, *Lancelot and Elaine*, and *The Passing of Arthur*; Lowell's *The Vision of Sir Launfal*; George Eliot's *Silas Marner*.

That the books set for study and practice, for the years 1906, 1907 and 1908, be the following: Shakspere's *Julius Caesar*; Milton's *Lycidas*, *Comus*, *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*; Macaulay's *Essay on Addison*, and *Life of Johnson*.

It was, further, resolved:

That the attention of the constituent bodies be called to the fact that, during the year 1903-4, measures should be taken to insure concerted action with regard to uniform entrance requirements in English for 1909 and the years immediately following.

Your committee recommend the adoption of the resolutions of this meeting. The committee also call attention to the second resolution and recommend that a committee be appointed to represent the association at the next conference of the several associations interested.

FRANCIS HOVEY STODDARD
WILSON FARRAND
FRANKLIN T. BAKER } Committee

President Farrand — The first report requires no action on the part of this convention, as it is simply the annual report of the secretary of the College Entrance Examination Board; but the last report, being a report of the committee appointed by this association, requires some action taken on the part of the convention, either to accept the report or reject it. [The motion for the adoption of the report of the committee was duly seconded, and was unanimously accepted.]

The report also recommends that a committee be appointed to carry this work on in the future, which will require separate action. Is it the pleasure of this convention that such a committee be appointed? [It was unanimously agreed to.]

RELATIVE FUNCTIONS AND POWERS OF PRESIDENT, TRUSTEES AND FACULTY

THE PRESIDENT

PRES. IRA REMSEN, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

It is astonishing how innocent and harmless some subjects appear at a distance of six months, when little thought is given to them, because of the period of time to elapse; but no less astonishing is it how formidable they become as the interval of time grows shorter and shorter. I must confess that this subject seemed extremely innocent and harmless when it was first proposed to me, and, as I have considered it from

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

time to time since then, the more I have come to believe that I know very little about it. It must be confessed, further, that a college president, who has been a president for only a few months more than a year, can not be very familiar with the relations of a president to trustees and faculty. My purpose is, nevertheless, to speak of the relations of the faculty and the trustees from the point of view of the president.

I came into the office of the president of this university only a little over a year ago, and I have not learned all. I am in the honeymoon period, if that is a proper expression. Last year we had a great celebration — what might be regarded as a "wedding feast." We were all in good humor. The relations existing between the trustees and faculty at that time were all that could be desired; they were admirable; they were beautiful. If you wish to learn how the trustees and president and faculty of a university should get along, come down and see how we get along.

In thinking over this subject, it has seemed to me that it might be well to know what the relations between the president, trustees and faculty of this university are as stated in official language; so I picked up our register this morning to see if I could find what system we are working under. I came into this system and was elected president. I had nothing to do with working it out. I find that but few rules have been laid down. There has been very little legislation on the subject, but there has been one thing from the beginning. There has been a desire on the part of the president (I can speak about that) and on the part of the trustees, to work together and discuss things in a friendly way, and I have never heard anyone say, "That is not my business, I don't think I will give that my attention." It has been rather a friendly, cooperative system, and it has worked well. The first rule that was laid down is this: "The trustees are the ultimate source of authority in all matters pertaining to the university. They act collectively through the standing committee and through the president of the university." That is simple enough. It is so simple that one can not discuss it. It says, "The trustees are the ultimate source of authority." We might discuss that

subject to the end of time, but we could not get away from that fact, that "the trustees are the ultimate source of authority in all matters pertaining to the university." Func-
tions and
powers
of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

I am inclined to say a word here in regard to the way our trustees regarded their trust at the outset. A large sum of money was left for the purpose of founding and maintaining a university. What the trustees were charged to do was to use that money according to the wishes of the testator. The trustees, it seems to me, showed almost supreme wisdom in their action. I should say here that the members of the board at that time have almost all passed away — only two are left. The men who composed the board of trustees were men of high character who realized the sacredness of the trust. The first thing that these gentlemen did was to get the will and read it very carefully, so as to know what the testator wanted. After reading the will carefully, they found he wanted a university. That is what Johns Hopkins wanted. They first concluded very wisely that they didn't know what a university is. Instead of assuming that they knew all about it, they didn't assume anything at all. They made a tour of the most prominent colleges and universities of the country and consulted with the leaders in these colleges. After they got home, they had a meeting and called in some of the presidents who had made the strongest impressions on them. When they got all the facts before them in this practical way, they began to see what the problem was, and step by step, and very slowly, they made up their minds what they must do in order to build up a university. They were always impressed with the idea that they had to perform a most serious act of great importance. It is very likely that the course of events in Baltimore would have been entirely different from what we are so familiar with, had the trustees taken a commonplace view.

But I am to talk of the relations of the trustees and the faculty from the point of view of the president. I remarked to you a moment ago that "the trustees are the ultimate source of authority in all matters, pertaining to the university." In whatever way we may look at the matter, that fact will remain,

and there is no desire to escape from it. If the trustees are true to that trust, they will keep their eyes on everything that is going on, and they will help to work out each and every problem we may be called on to work out.

Before I take up the next point, I find under the head of "President" the following: "The duties of this office are thus defined by the trustees, Sep. 14, 1876." They began work under this rule a few days after that.

The president of the university is the authorized means of communication between the board and the various officers of instruction and administration employed in the university. It shall be his duty to consult with the professors, in respect to the development of their various departments, and the general interests of the university; to determine the appropriate duties of the associates and fellows; and to exercise such superintendence over the buildings, apparatus, books, and other property as will insure their protection and appropriate use. In respect to these matters and all others which concern the welfare of the university, he shall consult frequently with the executive committee, and he shall attend the meetings of the board of trustees. Purchases, alterations, repairs, and other incidental expenses must not be ordered by any of the officers of the university without his previous assent, or the expressed authority of the board.

That was written in 1876. It has never been annulled or changed. Up to 1892 the president of the university attended the meetings of the board, but was not a member.

"By resolution of the trustees, May 2, 1892, the president of the university was constituted a member *ex officio* of the board, and also *ex officio* a member of the executive committee."

This probably expresses the relations that exist between the president of the university and the trustees in words, so far as any one can express them in words. But there are things we can not express in words—at least without the use of poetry. When we get in trouble, and find that ordinary words fail us, we turn to poetry, and we interpret that as we please, but I am not a poet.

It would be impossible for the president of the university to perform his duty under this rule without being on good terms with the trustees. He is the connecting link—not the

missing link — between the board and the faculty; he is a part of both sides. He is a member of the board of trustees, and he is also a creature of the board; so in one sense he is a part of both, being a member of the board of trustees, and also a part of the faculty. I am not sufficiently well versed in metaphysics to discuss that subject.

Func-
tions and
powers
of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

I think the rules are entirely satisfactory. We talk over the problems that present themselves. We try to do the best we can for the university as trustees and president. It is through the president that the business of the university is brought before the trustees. It is through him that the business is filtered. He must inform himself, therefore, in regard to everything that is going on in the university. There is one point I should mention here, and that is one of importance. The majority of the members of the board of trustees of most colleges do not reside where the college is located, but come from different places throughout the country. In the case of this university every member of the board of trustees is a resident of Baltimore. We hold monthly meetings and go over everything requiring attention. Of course that makes a difference. The trustees, residing in Baltimore, can be called together at almost any time. The board is as well informed in regard to the work of the university as the different committees, or the president of the university. Then we have an executive committee that goes over every question before it is brought to the attention of the trustees. The president must study the problems; he must familiarize himself with all the details connected with the work of the college, and with the work of the university, so that he can be prepared when he meets the executive committee, to explain these matters. The meetings of the executive committee furnish an opportunity to talk over everything freely and in an informal way.

There is another point in regard to which a word may not be out of place. Though the president here is a member of the board of trustees, he is not the presiding officer of that board. That is not the case in a large number of the most prominent universities, as you no doubt know. At Harvard the president of the university is the president of the board

**Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty**

of trustees, and president of all the committees, and I believe he is the presiding officer of everything else connected with the university over which there is a presiding officer. There are quite a number of universities in which the president of the university presides over the board of trustees and their committees. I will not go over the list. I think I shall not be censured if I quote what President Eliot of Harvard recently said to me on this subject. Referring to the fact that the president of Johns Hopkins University is not the president of the board of trustees, he said, "That is the fundamental defect of the Johns Hopkins University." He said most emphatically, "The president of the university should be the presiding officer of the board of trustees." I should not bring the matter forward here if I had any feeling on the subject. I do not feel that I could do any more for the university, if I were the presiding officer of the board of trustees, though the question raised is well worthy of consideration. As it is here, the president of the university can always go to the president of the board of trustees and talk over any matter in an informal way. That helps very much; and very frequently in that way a wiser conclusion can be reached than at the point of the bayonet. If an important question comes up that needs attention at once, the president can consult the executive committee; or, if it is possible to postpone action for two or three weeks, it gives time to consult the board of trustees.

You may say the chief duty of the trustees is to look after the finances of the institution. They can do that very much better than the faculty. Our board of trustees is composed of men from different walks of life. There are prominent business men and prominent lawyers, and others who are deeply interested in educational matters — men of experience — so that the members of the board of trustees are well equipped for their work. The trustees look after the finances, and furnish the money needed by the university, and the president and faculty spend the money. We must have means to carry on the work of the university. We depend very largely on our investments for our income, and the trustees are charged with

the duty of seeing that investments yield a sufficient income for the needs of the university.

So far as the appointment of members of the academic staff is concerned, that is a question of great importance that might be discussed, but I will not go into that in detail. I have no secrets. The appointments are made by the trustees. They must make the appointments. But how are they made? Do the trustees go out into the open and get the men without informing the president or the faculty, and bring them in and put them on the staff? Our trustees have never done so. Our trustees have never taken direct action in the *selection* of the members for appointment on the staff. The method has been for the president to consult with the members of the faculty, and, in accordance with the result of the consultations, recommendations are made for appointments on the academic staff. The appointments are then made by the trustees; no one is appointed by the board of trustees who is not nominated by the president with the approval of the academic staff.

There are other things that might be said on this subject, but I will not detain you longer, as I have said enough. In conclusion, let me emphasize this. Unless there are cordial relations and a friendly feeling between the president and the faculty on the one side, and between the president and trustees on the other, the results can not be satisfactory. If there is a desire to do the best that can be done for the students, and sensible men come together to plan the work, it matters little what rules are laid down, provided they are not in conflict with common sense; the results are sure to be good.

THE TRUSTEES

BY DR SIMON J. MC PHERSON, LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL

[Read by Dean J. S. Van Meter]

1 It may be assumed, I suppose, for the purposes of this discussion, that by "powers" we understand the right and ability to exercise authority and control; and by "functions," the proper use of such powers in specific acts and in general influence. It may also be assumed that "the relative functions and powers of president, trustees and faculty" differ variously from

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-]
ulty

those possessed and exercised by corresponding parties in Old World institutions. They are developments, still fluent and in process of realization, within our own educational system. Whatever we may think of their present evolutionary incompleteness, or even of their deficiencies, we must take them as they are and make the best of them.

It will be borne in mind that our own educational institutions are heterogeneous, to a considerable extent, in their types and in various elements of their internal administration. They are old and new, large and small, rich and poor. There are state institutions; institutions founded, and, in remaining instances, controlled and even managed by different branches of the Christian church; institutions established and sometimes dominated by individuals; and institutions combining at least two of these elements. But none of these is governed solely by its president, its faculty, or its alumni, nor is any controlled by a government department, or minister, of education; and, excepting proprietary schools, practically every one of them has its president, its faculty and its board of trustees.

2 Now in our most common type of educational institution, the powers if not the functions of the trustees are, at least before the law, preeminent. This is true whether the board is self-perpetuating, elected by the alumni, or appointed by the state or some ecclesiastical body. However we may lament or deride the fact, it is outstanding, established, well nigh universal. For better, for worse, we must adjust ourselves to it. However we might wish to modify it, we can hardly find a better way for the present than to accept and utilize it.

Possibly we may feel some slight but benign relief by trying to conceive the condition remaining if the average college, minus its trustees, should become completely independent and autonomous. If these nonprofessional trustees had worshiped the idols of the tribe or the market place, would the faculty, I wonder, be tempted to bow down to the idols of the cave; or the president, to the idols of the theater? Dr Edmund J. James reminds us in his recent inaugural address that "universities tend to become caste and class institutions. They tend to

become pharisaic in sentiment and action." He cites as examples, "Oxford and Cambridge at one time in their existence," and "nearly all the continental universities." We know the personal and institutional perils of professionalism, as urgent perhaps among teachers as in any other class. We appreciate the need and the obligation of keeping near to the human world. The crest of the highest wave is thrown up by the sea itself. We desire to keep our institutions responsive to the heart throbs of enlightened public opinion, for that it is which maintains us, corrects and finally judges us. We may fairly ask whether the American board of trustees be not an excellent organ for these purposes? Made up of various representative men, serving without salary, this body, at any rate, theoretically appears to be, for the school or college, a banking and trust company, a sanitary commission, a social mordant, an organ of public opinion, a jury. In any case its authority is paramount.

What are some of the powers of trustees, all directly or indirectly relative?

a They, as a body corporate and politic, acquire, hold, maintain and administer the property of the institution. Like the House of Commons or of Representatives, they keep the purse strings in their hands. The bread on our tables and the clothes on our backs testify to the "relative" importance of this power. I have been one of the trustees in four institutions, and I can feelingly bear witness that they must beg, and yet support themselves. They buy and sell and invest and pay salaries from the interest, without any commission. Sometimes they lose money and then—at least the president and the treasurer do not think that the finance committee is composed of thieves and idiots. The financial power and responsibility of trustees are certainly great and unenviably trying, for these things are vital to the success of any institution, specially in recent days. Their relations with president and faculty in this work ought to be friendly and unstrained and cooperative on both sides.

b In the last analysis, the trustees elect and they may dismiss the president and faculty. This power is terrible if

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

arbitrarily used. But it would still be so whoever held it. They should know the teaching force if they are to act justly, humanely and wisely. Yet they find difficulty in personally knowing it well. They must depend largely on the president, taking care to notice any idiosyncrasies on his part and to keep clear of any cliques or petty jealousies on the campus. They can not possibly avoid giving pain at times, but they are bound to inflict it only for necessary cause, and even then to hate such infliction. This necessity must be created for them almost exclusively by the interests of the students. For whatever may be said, and very much is to be said at many colleges and universities, in behalf of research work, the prime obligation, I believe, of every such institution is the education of its youth. The institution, with all its forces, president, faculty, trustees and everybody else, is for the student, and not he for it. The trustees have no right, legal or ethical, in my profound conviction, to interfere with any professor's free teaching of truth. Facts are facts and truths are truths, whether we like them or not. Nevertheless, in many departments of inquiry, the line between inherent truth and personal opinion, or even conviction, is a vanishing line. I am by no means clear that trustees should necessarily allow a teacher to exploit his personal opinions authoritatively. For instance, in economics, in sociology, in ethics, in religion, there is a disputed territory of opinion. What about the opinions of the trustees themselves? Do these set up another obligation? What also of chartered limitations, of the intentions of founders, or of the instructions accompanying specific endowments? Nice moral questions emerge here, which can not be resolved by irresponsible rhetoric.

c Trustees are the governing body in an institution. They are empowered and usually constrained by law to make regulations, to grant degrees, to enforce discipline. They are free to use their fiduciary discretion as to the methods by which these things are done, but they are responsible for seeing that these things shall be done. While their powers and functions are shared with president and faculty, whose expert advice

they must seek, and whose expert administration they should employ or follow, they are after all ultimately responsible.

3 But these startling powers of trustees have many limitations which largely determine their relative functions in the complex administration of an educational institution.

a One of these is suggested by the significance of their very name. They do nothing for themselves; they discharge a trust. They must be faithful as trustees. They administer on a property, perhaps of high value, and they are under the deepest obligations to be scrupulous, not only in regard to the ethics concerning property, and the laws of the state applicable to its care and use, but also to the known wishes of its donors. If they fail in their fiduciary capacity, the president and faculty suffer grievous wrong and the institution itself fails. It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful.

b Trustees are expressly restricted by the provisions of their charter, which in general terms defines their powers and duties and those of president and faculty. This instrument is the common fountain of authority and obligation for the three, and it should unite the three, and all three should make themselves familiar with it.

c Trustees, as I have already intimated, are limited in their powers and functions by the applicable general laws of the state as well as by their particular charter. In some cases they are very properly required, in their capacity as trustees, to take a new oath of allegiance to the Constitution and laws of both the state and the nation.

d They are limited by the purpose for which their trust was conferred, namely, to afford a higher education to all that enter the institution. The appointed beneficiaries of their trust are the students, to whose welfare they devote themselves in the act of accepting trusteeship. This is the common, controlling aim alike of themselves, of president and of faculty. If all three keep their eyes on this sublime purpose, there will be little conflict of functions or powers, little aloofness or want of cooperation, and, indeed, little need of discussing their mutual relations.

Func-
tions and
powers
of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

Func-
tions and
powers of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

e You may think that trustees also are limited in their powers by their own ignorance. So indeed they are; so likewise are all of us, even presidents, professors and teachers. When an adult, specially if he be a leader, begins to see and say that he does not know, he is beginning to learn — practical psychology at least. Perhaps this is only another way of avowing that trustees are restricted by the kind of persons constituting their board. I take that view. So far as it is self-elective, I think that the supreme test of their fidelity is revealed in their choice of new members. For one, I strongly favor, except in very young institutions, making up the board, in part, of alumni representatives who shall, if possible, be elected by the body of alumni. I think that among the members there may well be a few, not many, educators. Educated persons are desirable, if they are not narrowly educated and not all educated on the same pattern. Wideness of vision and a diversity of viewpoint, and therefore of occupation, seem to me as essential to a good board as to a good jury. Should there be specialists among these trustees? Yes, if they have breadth. Ordinary specialists do better as expert witnesses, I think, than as jurymen.

f Trustees are self-limited by the delegation of their powers; for they must delegate many if not most of these, and their wisdom can in no other way be more clearly discriminated than in such delegation. It is just here that they most shrewdly exercise some of their chief functions as distinguished from their powers. They confer these powers on fit agents, notably on president and faculty, and they do not lightly take these powers back.

4 I have now suggested many of the relative functions and powers of the three classes under consideration. But I may expressly mention a few such relations.

a Of the president in relation to the trustees I should say: (1) He is their chief purveyor of information, their principal reporter. They can not weigh and decide unless they know, and, situated as they usually are, there are many things which they can not know unless they are informed. By virtue of his position, he is most fully conversant with the pertinent facts. This puts on him a burden of duty toward the trustees nearly

as great as that which he sustains toward the faculty or the students. But it seems necessary.

(2) He is their expert advisor as to administration, instruction and indeed all matters pertaining to his ample office. He may give fuller and more specific information and advice to their leading committees, but he must also guide the board itself to a true view of things.

(3) He is their first executive officer. Very many of their decisions he must put into operation.

(4) He is their trusted colleague and collaborer. He should have, and he usually does have, a seat and a vote in the board. In any case, they must trust him and sustain him.

If he maintain these relations with them, the work will be pleasant, united and effective. Otherwise, nobody will be quite happy or enthusiastic and the cause will suffer.

b Of the faculty in relation with the trustees, I should say:

(1) It should have, in connection with the president, a large measure of approved autonomy in the organization of instruction and detailed government for the students. As a body of professional experts, it evolves and, if necessary, keeps evolving the curriculum for recommendation to them. Because its members touch the students constantly, not only in the classrooms but also, let us hope, in the generic life of the institution, it should understand these students thoroughly and should as kinsmen represent and stand for these students before the president and the trustees. It should be carefully graduated into live departments, in which every member of it has his place, his power and his accountability.

(2) The faculty should find open doors into the rooms of the trustees and their committees. If I were a president, I might possibly object to this, but as a trustee or member of the faculty, I should not; for the faculty needs representation on the common platform of the three related and controlling groups of the institution, not to start a strife of tongues nor to enlarge on small things, but to bring the pulsating life of all into view.

(3) Its members should know the trustees personally. This would be a difficult achievement for a large institution in this

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

busy world, but it is important to a clear and cordial understanding. Big things sometimes improve by being made smaller.

If these relations can be created and maintained, they will make any college world larger and better and happier.

THE FACULTY

BY PROF. GEORGE STUART FULLERTON, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Since promising your committee to speak on the subject before us, I have felt sincere regret. Not that I think that the freest discussion of any such subject need give rise to the least ill feeling on the part of any one, if the discussion be carried on with good taste and in a kindly spirit. But the subject is a broad one and difficult; and I would rather listen to others than be forced to express an opinion myself. However, since I have promised, I shall lay before you some thoughts which have special reference to one aspect of the subject. The time allotted to me will not allow me to do more. I shall confine my attention to institutions of the rank of universities, and shall dwell chiefly on the duties and responsibilities of the faculty.

If we describe a university as consisting of a body of older scholars engaged in the investigation of truth, and a body of younger scholars to whom instruction is given by the former, we simplify matters too much. This is, indeed, the soul of a university, but this soul can not function without a body. In the present state of the sciences, extended investigations and adequate instruction demand great collections of books, stores of costly apparatus, expensive laboratories, etc. The university must possess land and buildings; it must take care of its students, and pay the salaries of its professors. It is an institution which stands in certain relations to the state, enjoys rights and privileges conferred by it, and is bound to make for these some return in services rendered. It is the recipient of bequests and donations from private individuals which lay it under legal and moral obligations. It is, in short, a great organism, related in certain complicated ways to the greater organism of the state — taking that word in a broad sense, and its administration is not a thing to take lightly. In order that

it may be properly managed, a variety of gifts seems to be called for, and a differentiation of functions.

This appears to be clearly recognized, and we actually find the control of the affairs of our universities in the hands of three authorities, the trustees, the president and the faculty. The trustees are theoretically supreme, but in fact delegate much of their authority to others. The president is their representative, and seems to occupy the position of a general manager. To the teaching force is usually committed the control of the curriculum and the details of instruction.

In these three authorities we have, I think, the materials of a good government. It seems fitting that the ultimate authority should rest with a body of men somewhat detached from the institution, not pecuniarily dependent on it, and a number of whom are practical men of affairs. It seems proper also that an organism so complicated should have a single executive head, charged with the duty of keeping under some sort of oversight each of its many departments. That some things should be left to the faculty is so plain that it need not be supported by argument.

When, however, we approach the question of the precise definition of the duties and responsibilities of each of these three authorities, we may well speak with hesitation. I shall not attempt to cover this field; such knowledge is too high for me. What I propose to do is to make a plea for an increase in the responsibilities laid on the shoulders of the teaching force, an increase which many professors would, I think, find burdensome. As the administration of different institutions differs a good deal in detail, I shall dwell, not so much on the part that is played, as on the part which I think ought to be played, in the government of a university by the teaching force.

At the outset, let me beg you to bear in mind two things: first, that it is only as a center of investigation and instruction that a university has any excuse for existing at all. This is its very soul, and all else — its grounds, its buildings, its invested funds, its rights and privileges, its officers of administration — can be regarded as only a part of the machinery that the proper

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

functioning of this soul demands. It is to be regretted that so much machinery is necessary, for it is apt to absorb the attention. A university is sometimes judged to be prosperous when it is in the condition of a well fed, mindless man, or of a firm that succeeds in doing a large business in poor goods by means of energetic advertising. In the second place, let me remind you that a professor is directly interested in almost everything that can be done about a university. It seems easy to make a rough and ready division of duties, assigning to the board of trustees the control of the property of a university with the management of what may be called its "foreign affairs," and relegating to the faculty the advancement of science and the teaching of the students; but no complete separation of these functions is possible. The appointment of a new professor or the dismissal of a professor may raise or lower the tone of a whole faculty, and the policy according to which appointments and dismissals are made is of vital importance to the work of the institution; the establishment of a new department of instruction may cripple existing departments; the erection of buildings may make an adequate expenditure for books or apparatus impossible, or prevent the appointment of instructors more needful than either.

In view of such facts as these, I make no apology for urging that the faculty as such be brought into much closer relations to the board of trustees than is now the case at most institutions, and that it be, not permitted, but required, to lay before the trustees the result of its deliberations on a considerable number of matters which are at present regarded as hardly falling within its jurisdiction. The members of the faculty, I will not say, are, but I will say, ought to be, good judges of what will help or hinder their work, and it is for the sake of this work that the university exists. It goes without saying that it would be absurd to lay new responsibilities on the shoulders of the faculty without having some assurance that the responsibilities in question would be properly met. I shall have something to say later on this score; but first I shall try to make clear, by adducing a few particulars, what I mean by saying that it would be well to

give the faculty more of a voice in the administration of the affairs of a university.

I have said that the appointment of a new professor is a matter which concerns every member of a faculty. The quality of the work done by an institution, and its standing among other institutions, must depend ultimately on the scholarly abilities of its professors. If they are men of solid attainments, striking abilities and high ideals, the standing of the institution is assured, and nothing else can accomplish this end. A great university with a weak faculty is a contradiction, and can not exist as fact. The institution may once have been great, and may look forward to a recurrence of its greatness; but great it can not be so long as it has a feeble mind. To this mind every professor brings his contribution, and the appointment of an incompetent man to any chair ought to be regarded as the common misfortune of the whole faculty. It is not merely the misfortune of the small group of men who may already be teaching the same subject or allied subjects, though it touches these more nearly than others. It is a blow at the efficiency of the whole institution, and a step in the direction of the degradation of the faculty as a faculty.

Hence it seems proper that the faculty should be eagerly interested in the question of additions to its own ranks. It should give the most serious consideration to the problem of attaining a high standard of efficiency, and endeavor to rule out all personal considerations which might interfere with that end. It may well be that those who represent a given subject in a given institution are not, in the judgment of their colleagues, able to give the wisest and the most disinterested advice on the subject of a new appointment. It may be painful to oppose the efforts of such men to control the appointment, but a faculty which declines to interfere in such matters, out of a mistaken sense of courtesy to a group of colleagues, is false to its trust. When a chair becomes vacant, the faculty as such should have a voice in determining the kind of man that it is desirable to obtain. A sensible decision on this point can not be made without taking into consideration the peculiar

Func-
tions and
powers
of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

nature of the work that the institution as a whole is best fitted to do, and intends to do. If it aims chiefly at doing advanced work with a comparatively small number of students, it may be wise to choose one kind of man, and, if it intends to do something else, it may be wise to look for a man of another sort. The question is surely one for the whole body of scholars connected with a university to consider. To consult only those whose work is most nearly related to that of the man it is proposed to appoint is unwise, for it is absurd that the representatives of each subject of instruction should be appointed according to a different principle, and the faculty reduced to a heterogeneous and inharmonious mass. To leave the whole matter to the president is little better. A university is far too complex an organism to be carried satisfactorily in the mind of any one man, and above all of a man burdened with the varied duties of a president. Either he must consult individual professors—in which case we have the evils of individualism, or he must act of his own knowledge—in which case he will often act in ignorance.

2 The severance of the relation between a university and one of its professors must be a matter of grave concern to the faculty as a whole. I refer here to the dismissal of professors who hold appointments without time limit. That men who have been engaged to teach for a definite term of years should sometimes be dropped at the end of that period is a matter of which no one can complain. It is extremely important that the question of such reappointments should be decided wisely, and should not be left to the judgment or to the prejudices of one man. But against the principle of dropping men who have completed the term of service agreed on, nothing can be said. The man takes a risk when he accepts such a position; he usually hopes to make himself so useful that he will be reappointed; he is sometimes deceived in his expectations. As he looks forward to receiving ultimately an appointment which does not entail such risks, he is not discouraged from persevering in his career. In all the professions beginners must make up their minds to face serious risks; and, if the goal before

them be sufficiently attractive, able men will not be discouraged from attempting to reach it.

The case of the full professor is a somewhat different one. His position ought to be a difficult one to obtain, and it ought to be a very desirable position, if the level of the profession is to be kept up to the high standard demanded by the nature of the work which is to be done. Men of ability and energy should be made to feel that it is worth their while to enter on an academic career, to spend many years in preparation for their work, and many more years in filling subordinate positions. They can not be made to feel this unless the post which they hope ultimately to secure be such as to repay them for their prolonged effort. It is right that I should say here that I think the lot of a professor, even under existing circumstances, is one by no means to be despised. He does not enjoy a very large salary, it is true; but his work is agreeable; he has from a fourth to a third of the year to himself, and may devote the time to investigations which are a joy in themselves and which he hopes may bring him renown; he holds a social position much above that of the great majority of men no richer than himself; his tenure of office is not, as a rule, insecure. If, then, I urge that his position be made one of greater dignity and security than it is at present, I must not be supposed to be asking that a particular group of unhappy men be made happy. The happiness or unhappiness of a limited number of individuals is not a matter of the greatest moment in any case. What is important is that certain positions be made so desirable that men even better than those that now hold them may be induced to compete for them.

One way of attaining this is to raise the salary attached to the office. Large salaries undoubtedly exert an influence even on the minds of those who are born to be scholars. It is however worthy of remark that the salary which is actually paid at present is not the chief factor in deciding men who are seeking chairs in our universities to go into the profession; and it is extremely doubtful whether the salaries paid will ever be so high as to command men of a high order, in the absence of other

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees;
and fac-
ulty

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

considerations. The degree of independence granted professors, the dignity of the position, the freedom from anxiety which security in tenure of office brings with it, certainly have quite as much influence as money in making a chair in a university a thing to be sought after. Some degree of independence seems absolutely essential, if the position is not to be made an absurd one. The duties of a professor are investigation and instruction. If he is not to teach the truth as it is revealed to him, but is to lay before the public just what some external authority — perhaps a president or board of trustees — may prescribe, he becomes a man of straw, and the university little better than a farce. If he may be deposed from his position for slight causes, he must be every night on a bed of thorns. Men who prepare themselves for professorships become unfitted to take up work of a wholly different sort. University positions are relatively few, and even a good man can not feel sure, when he loses one, that he will speedily obtain another. Men must feel secure of their position, if they are to give their undivided attention to their science and to their students. They must be assured that they can live, even if they can not live very well.

On the other hand, it is well to remember that absolute independence can not be granted to any member of a community, and that absolute freedom of speech never has been tolerated, and probably never will be tolerated in any civilized state. Men may think what they please, but even the private citizen may not shock the sensibilities of the community beyond a certain point by the frankness of his expressions; and there seems still more reason why those who occupy chairs in our universities, and speak for their institutions as well as for themselves, should recognize that their freedom is not absolutely without limits. It is conceivable that a professor should embrace doctrines so incendiary, and should set forth his views in language so startling, that it would be wholly out of question that he should be retained in his position as a public teacher. Here, as in most situations in life, we seem forced to make a compromise. A large measure of freedom appears to be necessary, but absolute freedom impossible. The question

before us is, how shall we determine the measure which may safely be granted?

Again. Professors partake of the frailty of our common human nature. If they are irremovable, a certain number of them may relax their efforts, and rest on laurels already won, or yield to the temptation to increase their incomes at the expense of their science. As we all know, such cases are by no means unheard of. Moreover, professors may, with the lapse of time, develop idiosyncrasies which quite defeat the purpose of their appointment. They may be unable to get on with students, may prove to be hopeless as teachers, or may be unable or unwilling to adjust their own work to the work of the university as a whole. That such men should be permitted to obstruct the activity of their department, perhaps a very important one, till such time as they may be removed by old age or by disease, does not seem reasonable. Universities have rights, as well as those who occupy chairs in them.

To meet all such cases as the above, and to lessen the discontent and apprehension which are generally aroused at present by the removal of professors—a discontent and apprehension which I can not but think distinctly harmful—I suggest the following: Let the proposed removal be reported to the faculty by the board of trustees, through the president; and let the whole matter be thoroughly discussed at some later date by a joint body consisting of the president, a committee of the trustees and a committee representing the faculty. It can not be to the interest of the faculty to defend men who are incompetent or who neglect their duty. It is very much to the interest of the faculty to see to it that desirable men are not made to feel insecure in their positions, and that errors in judgment are reduced to a minimum. I may add that the professor who has been found wanting by a committee of his peers, as well as by trustees and president, seems to have little cause of complaint if he is removed from his position, and it is likely that the public will turn a deaf ear to his upbraiding.

3 I have indicated above that all such matters as the establishing of a new department in a university, the expenditure

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

of money for buildings, the purchasing of apparatus and books, etc., directly concern the faculty. It may or may not be a good thing for a university to attempt to spread its work over new fields. Local pride, or the accident of a promised endowment, should not mislead it into doing what it can not do well, and what, perhaps, does not greatly need to be done. The excessive zeal of individual professors should not be allowed to result in the hypertrophy of single departments to the detriment of the institution as a whole. Each thing that is done concerns all, and all should have some influence in determining what shall be done. Hence, I suggest that all such matters as those above mentioned be decided in conference with the faculty, and not independently of it. As the ultimate authority lies elsewhere, it will always be possible to eliminate from the considerations which determine the final decision advice which smacks of self-interest or is colored by prejudice.

4 The last of the points on which I have elected to dilate is the conferring of honorary degrees. The qualifications which must be possessed by those who would take degrees at our universities in the usual way, i. e., by earning them, it is commonly left to the faculties to determine. Mistakes are occasionally made, of course, but the conferral of such a degree is at least *prima facie* evidence of a certain measure of scholarly attainment on the part of the candidate. The recommendation of candidates for honorary degrees is not usually left to the faculty of a university.

Now, if there is one thing more than another about our universities that strikes the reflective man as anomalous, it is that they distribute every year a great number of honorary degrees, of which really very few are conferred solely in recognition of great attainments in science or letters. Political prominence, a reputation for philanthropy, popularity as a preacher, election to the presidency of a college — all these are regarded as establishing a sufficient claim to a doctorate of some sort. In speaking as I do, I mean to include our leading institutions as well as our lesser ones. Let any man read over the list of honorary degrees which have been conferred during

the last 10 years by a dozen or so of our leading institutions of learning, and he will be convinced that the eminence most highly prized by those who control them is not scholarly eminence, and that university degrees have largely lost their original and their proper significance.

It is not surprising that men in all walks in life should knock at the doors of our universities—or let their friends knock for them—with the demand that they be made doctors. Americans love distinction quite as much as other men. A German may become "Geheimerath," or "Commerzienrath," or a "Rath" of many other sorts, and may have the daily pleasure of hearing his title. If he be successful and energetic, he may become a member of many orders, and on state occasions may cover his breast with decorations till he resembles a Christmas tree without the candles. A Frenchman may become an officer of the Legion of Honor, and may wear the appropriate mark of the honor which has been conferred on him. Military titles and university degrees are almost the only resource of the American who wishes it clearly understood by the general public that he is not as other men are. Military titles are out of the question for some men, for it is not every one who wishes to serve even in the militia. But a university degree may be obtained by a man who attends quietly to his own business, whatever that may be, and who prospers in it. Meanwhile, the universities are placed in an anomalous position. They are giving pleasure, it is true, to a considerable number of unscholarly men, some of them men of much worth and deserving of the good will of the community; but they are doing this at the expense of rendering their own degrees meaningless, and bringing them into light esteem in the mind of the intelligent public.

To remedy this state of affairs, I suggest that the nomination of candidates for honorary degrees be placed in the hands of the group of scholars who are charged with the recommendation of candidates for degrees taken in course. I suggest also that those on whom this great responsibility is laid be given very clearly to understand that they must in all their nominations

Func-
tions and
powers
of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

hold in view the aims with which universities have been founded and the purposes they are intended to serve.

You have seen that I plead for no slight increase in the dignities and responsibilities of university faculties. It is right that the question should be asked: Are the faculties able to meet such responsibilities properly? To this I must answer frankly, that I do not think they are at present. Men who have not been trained to responsibility are, as a rule, little fitted to assume much of it at once. I hope that I shall not give great offense to my colleagues if I say that an experience of a good many years has led me to conclude that professors are somewhat myopic and rather unpractical. In enthusiasm for his own department, a professor may easily forget the larger interests of the institution as a whole. Rivalries and factional strifes are not unknown among the brotherhood. The desire to be courteous to a colleague may stand in the way of remedying an abuse. Scholars are not necessarily acquainted with the world of men and things with which a university must stand in relation, and they may propose foolish measures. Even self-interest is a factor which must sometimes be reckoned with.

I believe there is much good material in the faculties as they are at present, but I think that it will need training, if it is to exercise the functions that I have indicated and others of the sort. I think, however, that, when new appointments are made, there should be an effort to secure men not incapable of exercising such functions. A transference of responsibilities might take place by degrees, without entailing any great risk, and it is such a transference that I urge.

In closing let me say a word about the president. "A visitor from Europe," says Mr Brice, "is struck by the prominence of the president in an American university or college, and the almost monarchial position which he sometimes occupies towards the professors as well as towards the students." It is evident that, were the modifications in the constitution of our universities, that I have suggested, carried out, the position of president would not be what it now is. The president would be, not a power outside of the faculty and placed in authority over it—too often a wall of separation between the faculty

and the board of trustees — but, rather, an influential member of the faculty and its natural leader. How the matter may strike one who has actually been president, I do not know. But to me it seems that some relief from the crushing weight of responsibility and from the innumerable duties now allotted to the president of a university might well be regarded as a boon. No man can do well what a university president is expected to do; and the mere fact that he is expected to do it, is enough to make trustees passive and professors selfish. That the ideal faculty needs such a leader as a president might be, I feel very certain.

DISCUSSION

Dr James H. Canfield — Having served 14 years as a member of the university faculty, eight years as a university president, and six years as an educational trustee, there is naturally some doubt in my own mind as to whether I am brought here today as an expert or as a horrible example. Granting the truth of President Remsen's statement, that in a discussion of this kind one ought to confine himself strictly within the limits of his experience, it would not seem difficult for me to speak to the question. Yet it must be confessed that it is with great misgivings that I open the discussion. There is some question as to whether this subject is most wisely chosen, the personnel of this association considered and the themes in which it is presumably interested taken well into account. There is a question also whether it is possible to discuss this theme without incurring the danger of serious misunderstanding. Yet it would seem that there may be sufficient interest on the part of those present to warrant the action of the executive committee in the choice of the theme, and we certainly ought to be able to discuss a question of this kind without the slightest tinge of personal feeling.

There can be no doubt that in every university faculty are to be found gentlemen who are quite as competent to administer the affairs of the university as is its president. Beyond question, there is not a faculty in the country from whose number may not be drawn several men entirely competent for educational administrative tasks. The entire question of government and administration by the faculty is not based on any sweep-

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

ing denial of executive ability on the part of the faculty, considered individually, at least, on the part of some. But in the discussion of this theme it is necessary to consider the faculty as a whole and it goes without saying, and naturally and properly and without adverse criticism, that the temper of mind which turns a man to the higher forms of scholarship and to investigation and research is not the temper which fits him for executive work. For this reason it is true that by far the greater number in every faculty neither desire to assume administrative burdens nor are extraordinarily competent for such tasks. In the average faculty of say 50 men, it is perhaps true that five will be found who are both willing and able to consider and solve administrative problems; it is doubtful whether the proportion exceeds this. Both experience and observation unite in saying that quite generally faculties prefer to be relieved of executive work; each member to be set unincumbered in the course which he has chosen as his specialty.

Of course there are faculties, and faculties — we may as well be frank about that. On the one side we find conditions which have prompted the epithalamium of President Remsen; while on the other is that illustration of friction and disintegration, known to some of us at least, in which, if the trustees of a certain institution had followed the suggestions of different members of the faculty with regard to other members of the faculty, there would have been no members of the faculty left in place. It is true that these are two extremes — it is to be hoped that the last is an extreme — and between these two lies the experience of the colleges and universities at large, in which admirable human traits and some not so admirable are quite generally blended.

Some time since I chanced on a quotation in an educational pamphlet which interested me very much. It defined the relations of a president of a college or a university to the trustees and faculty, and ran as follows:

To the regents (trustees) he must be the one who wisely yet vigorously executes their plans, who sees that every man is well placed and that every dollar is well spent, who can at any time put the board in possession of any information it may need regarding the material condition or educational work of the

university, and who will make it possible for the board to consider general policies rather than be compelled to master details. He is to keep the board in touch with every person and every interest and every condition; but only in touch, not burdened thereby.

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

To the faculty he is the one who makes possible uninterrupted attention to the work of investigation and instruction, who sees that everyone has the greatest equality in right of way and all reasonable assistance in running his race, who prevents friction and removes misunderstandings; who is sufficiently sympathetic and sufficiently informed as to the work of each to quicken with commendation where commendation will count most, and to stand like a wall of adamant between an instructor and unjust criticism or attack from either inside or outside the university world; and who possesses wisdom, energy and tact — the three conditions precedent to successful leadership.

This seemed to me exceedingly wise and very well put, and at the same time strangely familiar. I set about tracing its origin, and found that it was a quotation from a letter of acceptance which I had written when first entering on an educational administrative position. It is not remarkable therefore, that it seemed both wise and well expressed. But there seemed to be something lacking; and after a while it came to me that there was somewhere a memorandum of a clause which I had withdrawn from the original draft of this letter because not possessing sufficient moral courage to include it. That memorandum was found among some old files of papers; and it seems only proper today (when there is no such need of moral courage on the part of the speaker) to add it to the paragraphs already quoted:

Whose authority will be entirely commensurate with his responsibility; and whose seat in the saddle will be sufficiently firm, and whose moral courage will be sufficiently strong to secure the prompt dismissal of every unworthy and incompetent instructor — in the interests of the students, of sound education, of wise administration, of economy, and of a decent regard for the reputation and security of tenure of the more worthy members of the faculty.

You will see that this recognizes, as did President Remsen, the trustees as the source of all authority and as carrying the chief burden of responsibility. The president is an executive,

**Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty**

though necessarily something more; and the members of the faculty are also executives and administrators, each within the line of his own department. This is a natural division of labor, it is a division of labor which corresponds to the most approved forms in the administrative world today, and it demands the same lines of organization and methods of work which are bringing the American people so rapidly to the front.

If you are to build a house, you know in a general way what you wish; but your first and wisest action is to call in a competent architect, ask him to submit plans, and very largely abide by his judgment. That is precisely what a wise board of trustees will do regarding a president. That is precisely the wisest thing done by the trustees of Johns Hopkins at the very outset; action on their part so approved by the world at large that this might almost be called Gilman University. The trustees may not quite say to the president, "Take this institution and run it as though it were your private business," because that is practically to shirk all responsibility, and this they may not do. But surely the relations to the board of a wisely chosen president will be exactly those set forth in the first paragraph of the letter from which quotation has been made; and these call for large freedom of action on his part.

Precisely as the board delegates certain duties and responsibilities to the president and leaves him a free hand, the president will delegate certain responsibilities and duties to the faculty and leave each with the initiative and with a free hand within his department. He would be utterly unworthy of his position, if in all administrative matters he did not seek constantly the advice of his faculty; and his success certainly depends on his approving to his faculty his choice of ways and means. But all this is a very different matter from being obliged to share with his faculty his responsibilities and his authority, and this sharing is that which I understand is sought by the paper read by Professor Fullerton.

In all departmental expenditures, in all departmental appointments, in departmental courses and methods of work, the department itself ought to take the initiative, always by and with the advice and consent of the president and the trustees. This is

necessary in order that departmental matters may conform, reasonably at least, to the general lines of policy established by the trustees. But, when it comes to the apportionment of the resources of the institution, to the consideration of general expenditures, and to the choice of administrative details, it seems absolutely impossible to share all these with the faculty, and it is unwise and impolitic to ask the faculty to carry a part of this burden. There have been a thousand experiments in these directions without one of them having been entirely satisfactory or even reasonably satisfactory. Faculties, as a whole, can not be expected to distinguish between departments, to determine the comparative values of departmental work, and therefore can not say what shall be advanced and encouraged and what needs to be held in check: in a certain sense at least, what needs to be rewarded and what needs to be punished. There are times in the history of every institution, as in every business venture no matter how well conducted, when in all probability it would mean absolute bankruptcy if the actual financial condition were disclosed. There are times when it is most desirable and most convenient for the members of the faculty themselves to be able to say truly that they do not know the exact status. And yet without knowing the exact financial status, they can not act wisely and efficiently. The proposed increase of faculty responsibility would be simply and inevitably the old story oft repeated of the weakness of divided responsibility, in place of the energy and (proper) secrecy and despatch possible only to a single administrator.

Times have changed, and we change with them. What was best and possible in the small college of 50 or 75 years ago, is absolutely impossible in the larger college or the university of today. A hundred comparisons might be made on either end of the line, between college administration and the general administration of the business world, each of which would sustain this contention. We have reached the point where we must secure the highest efficiency in administration as well as the highest efficiency in departmental work; and in the very nature of things the two can not be successfully commingled.

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

[The speaker illustrated his discussion at every point by experiences of his own in each of the three divisions of college and university life, through the last quarter of a century; and closed by saying that, while a college should never be managed as a shop or a factory is managed, he most sincerely believed that all successful educational administration depends on a wise differentiation of the responsibilities and duties of trustees, president and faculty, with a clear recognition of the interdependence of all three, and of the fact that all are working for a common end — the inspiration and uplifting of the student and the large and generous service of the commonwealth.]

Pres. James M. Taylor — [A summary] The very worst form of government for a college or university is that of a faculty. That is not because there are not able men in every faculty who are capable of administering the institution, but because in the nature of the case the government of a faculty is that of an oligarchy. The evils of a democracy are distinct, and of a monarchy describable, but nothing is so bad as an oligarchy, and to that condition every faculty government tends or has come. A faculty is made up chiefly of specialists, for the most part untrained in the business of administration and without special responsibility for the college and its larger relationships. They are interested, and they ought to be, chiefly in particular departments. Moreover their legislation on minor matters, which are too often magnified into principles, and with individual concerns of students, in themselves unimportant, has no tendency to enlarge their views of administration. All the evils of special legislation as noted in our political conditions grow rankly in faculty procedure. Again, the special office of the faculty is to teach. It is a waste of energy and a misuse of power to expend the strength of specialists and scholars on administrative detail. Any well organized college office can do in a few minutes the work that it takes a faculty hours to accomplish, and can do it as a rule much better. That marks the enormous waste of the best material in the educational world, and it marks also a most unhappy thing for scholarship. The introduction into lives that ought to be kept to the quiet and peace of a student's research, of the elements of admin-

istrative concern and worry, with consequent waste of energy and time, and the present outreaching for more of this particular kind of power, are not favorable signs for American scholarship. One might also venture the remark that, even in purely educational questions, it is a great stretch of imagination to think of the members of the faculty, as a whole, as experts in educational theory. In the interests, therefore, of economy of the highest mental life, the work of administration should be kept to narrow limits and specially trained individuals. President Taylor referred in this connection to no. 70 of the *Federalist*, where Hamilton deals with the question of a vigorous executive and its supposed inconsistency with the genius of Republican government, indicating that with plurality in the executive comes always a tendency to conceal faults, to destroy responsibility, to divide the censure of public opinion where due, and to render its aim uncertain. Unity conduces to energy, decision, activity, despatch.

President Taylor referred to what had been claimed regarding the appointment and removal of professors and argued, not only on the basis of what he had urged but of the teaching of experience, that inefficiency would mark such a method of appointment. He instanced one case where it took a university eight years to fill a certain chair. As regards removals, he indicated the special applicability of Hamilton's doctrine regarding the division of responsibility with the plural executive, and showed how the sympathy of professors with one another and the personal relationships involved would make what is always a most difficult step practically impossible, if the responsibility were with the faculty.

It is to be remembered that all the wisdom, experience, and common sense of the members of the faculty are at the call of the trustees and president, and no one with any qualifications for the administration of a great institution would for one moment dispense with these even if he were allowed to. On the whole, it would be better to confine the legislation of the faculty to educational policies and principles and to make these subject to the veto of the president with the right of appeal from his decision to the trustees. All this is urged in the interest of the

Func-
tions and
powers
of presi-
dent,
trustees,
and fac-
ulty

Func-
tions and
powers
of pres-
ident,
trustees
and fac-
ulty

greatest work that any faculty or any body of men can do, namely, teaching and investigation.

The chief authority of the college should be in the hands of the president. This is not based on a view of the dignity or aggrandizement of the office but on the fact that experience shows and all the tendency of modern organization has emphasized the fact in government, corporations and business houses, that a single responsible head guarantees the largest efficiency. The proposition that the president's office should be put in commission because its power and duties are so manifold that no one can adequately perform its functions, ignores the fact that no great head of a business house or government does all its work. If a functionary can not work through others, unifying all, he is not an administrator. But it will be found in colleges as in other corporations that decentralization will promote friction, waste and inefficiency. Under the trustees the president is their representative and directs the whole institution under its organic law. It also guarantees the rights and privileges of every other officer within his sphere. If a president can not carry his duties or can not live in harmony with others and respect their places and dignities, he should be put out. This claim for power in the hands of the president, commensurate with his responsibility to the trustees and the outside world, is based on the nature of efficient administration and has no respect to the dignity or the honor of the position.

It was pointed out in conclusion that the present organization of trustees is an advantage to an institution, that it gives a wider outlook than is possible to men engaged in simply professional work, that the boards of trustees have seldom if ever assumed to dictate in purely educational questions, and, if they have done so, it has been commonly under the leadership of some expert. The highest function of a board of trustees is to appoint a president and to see to it that he performs the duties of his office, and to serve as a court of last resort. But whatever is done or left undone as regards the trustees and president, it is clearly demonstrated in the interests of scholarship that the functions of administration may be best performed, not by train-

ing the whole faculty to be presidents, but by training on the one hand a race of scholars and teachers, and on the other a race of administrators with scholarly interests and appreciations and specialists in educational practice and theory.

Functions and powers of president, trustees and faculty

Dean T. F. Crane — I confess I am somewhat surprised at the remarks of the last speaker. I should have supposed that as a college president he would have taken a different attitude in self-defense.

It seems to me that the numerous and increasing demands on college presidents make the burden almost too great to be borne. They are borne, and well borne, by the present incumbents of these high offices, but it is for their successors that I fear, and I believe it will be necessary in the future to devolve on the faculty more and more of the administrative duties of the position.

I think this is also necessary in order to train the faculty to bear the share of administrative burdens which I believe belongs to it. When the trustees of Johns Hopkins University were recently obliged to seek a head for that famous institution, it was from the faculty that he was selected.

The administrative officers of every university, the presidents, deans etc., must be chosen from the faculty, and it will be impossible to train up these officers unless the faculty is accustomed to a larger share in the administration than has been customary in the past.

I think the tendency is everywhere to recognize this fact and to relieve the president of many of his former burdens by the appointment of administrative officers, such as deans etc., who in many cases have charge of the discipline of the college, a duty once invested in the president alone.

It is for reasons of this nature that I believe it is wise and necessary for the president to share to a greater extent his administrative functions with the faculty.

President's address

Friday evening, November 28

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

EXISTING RELATIONS BETWEEN SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

BY HEAD MASTER WILSON FARRAND, NEWARK ACADEMY

The growth of cordial relations and of cooperation between school and college in this country has been specially marked during the last 10 years, and in no part of the country has this growth been more noticeable than in that geographic division of the United States known as the "Middle states and Maryland." Even at the risk of being charged with provincialism, I am inclined to assert that this growth, and the relations now existing between higher and secondary institutions of learning, can be studied better here than in any other district; and it will surely not be considered by this audience a vainglorious claim that a large share of the credit for the improved condition of affairs in this respect is due to this association.

It was in 1892 that the College Association of the Middle States and Maryland opened its doors and welcomed to its fireside the schools of the region. This was not an original move, for a few years before a similar organization had been formed in New England, that breeding ground of associations. The possibilities and the practical value of such a union of interests were clearly recognized by many of the farsighted members of the College Association, but there was some opposition, and more skepticism. A few schoolmasters attended the meeting at Swarthmore, in order to let the college representatives know how "willing" we were, and I well remember a conversation between the sessions with a certain college president, who said to me: "Why do you want to come in with us? We have our problems, and you have your problems, but our interests are not the same." I doubt if a college president could be found willing to father that remark today.

In the summer of the same year, 1892, the National Educational Association had taken a momentous step by the appointment of the famous committee of 10, under whose auspices were held a series of conferences on the various subjects making up the

school curriculum, the committee and each of the conferences ^{President's} being composed of both college and school teachers. The work ^{address} of this committee and the value of it to education in this country are too well known to call for extended notice. It was the first systematic attempt to consider in all its aspects the broad question of the school course of study, and it has had a profound influence on American education. The programs suggested by the committee will not be found in many schools, some of its conclusions, and some of the pronouncements of the individual conferences have not been accepted by the sober judgment of the educational world, but its service was none the less marked. It unified and cleared educational thought by supplying an authoritative basis for discussion, it formulated and stated in concrete shape many of the problems that up to that time had been vague and formless, and, if it did not solve these problems, it threw a flood of light on them. It is not too much to say also, what is more pertinent to our present discussion, that the work of the committee of 10 established beyond peradventure the wisdom, and even the necessity, of the union of school and college forces to secure an adequate solution of our educational problems.

In 1893 came the first tangible result of the union of forces in this Middle states association, when, on the motion of President Low, a committee, consisting of five college professors and five schoolmasters, was appointed to see what could be done toward securing uniformity of entrance requirements in English. The work of this committee is well known — how it secured the appointment and cooperation of a similar committee from New England, and later of still other committees from the Middle West and South, how, wonderful to relate, this joint body succeeded in agreeing on a uniform requirement, and how, still more wonderful, this requirement was adopted by nearly every college in the United States. The point with which we are concerned now, however, is the practical cooperation in this work of school and college teachers. I am disclosing no secrets of the prison house when I say that work on that committee proved a revelation to every one engaged in it, and I think that I am within the limits of strict truth, when I say that the great value of

President's address

the committee's services to education lay, not in its securing of uniformity of English requirements, great as that service was, but in bringing into harmony and into cooperation school and college teachers of English, in securing on the part of each an understanding of the special difficulties confronting the other, and in arousing in both a realizing sense of the identity of their common problem—that of rightly training the student in the use and appreciation of his mother tongue.

In the winter of 1895-96 another step was taken of unusual interest, though the tangible results were by no means what were hoped for. I refer to the so called "Columbia conferences" of 1896. These had no official connection with this association, but were so largely actuated by its spirit, and so largely composed of its own members, as to seem almost part of its work. At the invitation of President Low, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania and Cornell sent delegates to each of six committees, devoted respectively to the subjects of Latin, Greek, French, German, history and mathematics. An equal number of schoolmasters was invited to take part in the conferences, so that each committee was composed of six college teachers and six school teachers. Each committee succeeded in agreeing on the statement of an entrance requirement in its own subject, and these were recommended to the six colleges for adoption. It is one thing, however, for a delegate from a college to agree to a matter in a conference, and quite another thing for the college faculty to ratify his action. Two or three of the colleges concerned adopted the recommendations of the conferences, but the others declined to do so for one reason or another, and the whole matter was finally dropped. The movement was not entirely without result, however; modification of requirements was made along the lines suggested, so that the existing discrepancy was somewhat reduced, the colleges were brought more squarely than ever face to face with the evils arising from a lack of uniformity, and a great gain was made in bringing about a better understanding and heartier cooperation between school and college men.

The next notable step in the same direction was the appointment by the National Educational Association in 1895 of the committee on college entrance requirements. This committee presented in 1899 an exhaustive and most valuable report. It adopted the wise plan of calling on existing organizations, such as the American Historical Association and the Modern Language Association, to frame requirements in their respective subjects. These were drawn up in every case, I believe, by joint committees of school and college teachers, and the work was so well done that, when the College Entrance Examination Board took up the task of framing requirements, it found ready to its hand authoritative statements, that needed only slight editorial work to put them into usable shape. The work of this committee has done more than is generally realized to bring about an adequate solution of some of our most troublesome problems.

The latest step in the series was the establishment in 1899 by this association of the College Entrance Examination Board of the Middle States and Maryland. I need not recount to you the history of this movement, for it is part of your records and fresh in your memory. It seemed almost Utopian to imagine that one set of examinations could serve for admission to any college in the country — except Harvard, but thanks to hearty recognition and cooperation on the part of the colleges, thanks to wise and judicious planning, thanks to skilful and broad-minded administration, the seemingly impossible has been accomplished, and the board stands today a successful fact. It is not too much to say that the establishment of the board would have been utterly impossible at the beginning of the decade, and is the crowning achievement of 10 years of steady progress.

I have thus reviewed rapidly the salient points in the history of the relations between school and college in the last 10 years. I have touched only on those movements that began in our own domain of the Middle states and Maryland, or that were truly national in their scope; I have said nothing of the organization of associations similar to this in the West and South; I have

passed over many instances of hearty cooperation, many cases of valuable service; my catalogue has been but partial, but it has been sufficient, I think, to prove the point that I am endeavoring to make, the marked progress during the last decade in the establishment of cordial relations and of cooperation between school and college, and incidentally the part played in that work by this association.

The situation has changed materially in 10 years. Then we schoolmasters were in the position of striking miners; we were fighting for the redress of grievances and for the recognition of our union. Today we do not even ask for arbitration; we are able, speaking broadly, to take up with the colleges almost any problem as a matter of mutual concern, to be settled on the basis of the best interests of education. And yet, marked as has been the advance, cordial as are the relations, genuine as is the understanding, the situation is not all that is to be desired. I do not say this in a spirit of complaint; my feeling is chiefly of appreciation and gratitude, but it is important to see the situation clearly, and my aim is to point out frankly and plainly certain respects in which matters can be, and should be improved.

In the first place, the attitude of some schoolmasters is not altogether conducive to harmony. At a certain gathering last winter, when the advisability of having school teachers take part in the work of the examination board was being discussed, a certain head master said, "Let us have no dealings with the enemy! Let the colleges set their own examinations, and let us keep ourselves free to fight." I have in my possession a letter from a valued friend, a head master of recognized ability and of more than local reputation, protesting against the "catalogue of injustice to secondary schools," and adding that "patience has ceased to be a virtue, deference is an absurdity." These are exceptions, but they are not solitary, and their existence shows that there is a feeling still smoldering. Partly this feeling is due, no doubt, to our inborn love of fighting, which dies hard, partly to our natural conservatism, which does not fully grasp the altered condition of affairs, and partly, per-

haps, to the fact that some just causes of irritation still remain. President's address

In the second place, the statements that I have made in regard to the cordial treatment of the schools by the colleges do not apply equally to all colleges. There are institutions that meet the schools with the most admirable frankness and freedom, in a spirit that inspires confidence, but there are also others. There are a few that still maintain, as clearly as they dare, that the college is the supreme arbiter, that it is its province to say what it wishes, and that it is the school's part to conform. There are more that recognize the desirability of cooperation, but fail in the application of the principle. This is due, I am convinced, mainly to ignorance of actual conditions. I have seen college officials astounded when the practical effect of certain actions was pointed out to them. They had intended to secure a different result, but they did not know the true conditions.

There are very few colleges today that are not honestly trying to meet the schools halfway. It seems possible, however, for a college to lay down officially a line of policy, and for members of its faculty to nullify that policy in action. We have been discussing this afternoon the relative powers and functions of president, trustees and faculty — altogether too delicate a subject for a mere schoolmaster to touch. It was suggested to the executive committee by a college professor — whether out of the depths of bitter experience deponent sayeth not — “but I am not sure that the schoolmaster can not throw some light on the subject.” President Eliot once said that it appeared to be easier in practice for a department to determine the policy of the university, than for the university to determine the policy of a department. It would not be conducive to harmony if I were to bring forward concrete instances in support of this position, but you may rest assured that if it were wise to do so, any doubt that might linger in your minds would be entirely removed.

Do I make clear the point at which I am aiming? It is that in some institutions, which as institutions are in hearty co-operation with the schools, individual professors and indi-

vidual departments nullify, in part, the official policy of the college. This state of affairs is due to two causes. In the first place it is due to defective or faulty organization. This question is altogether too delicate for me to deal with in detail, even if I were competent, as I am not, but I may say in passing that the question of university organization is one of the most pressing and most vital educational problems of the day, that the defects of organization are more clearly evident to those outside than is generally suspected by those within college walls, and that these defects have an influence on interests far broader than the simple prosperity of the institution. The real reason, however, is not to be found in defective organization. It lies in lack of knowledge on the part of those charged with the conduct of affairs. When we consider how few of the professors in certain institutions ever come into direct contact with schoolmasters in such associations as this, or ever engage with them in free discussion of their common problems, we cease to wonder that their judgment is sometimes one sided, and that they occasionally carry into effect measures that produce startling results.

There has been an immense improvement in the relations between school and college in the last 10 years, and this advance has been due not to coercion, but to the recognition on both sides that the problem is a joint one, and to the full and frank union of forces to secure its solution. That the relations are not yet perfect is due to the fact that the leaven has not yet permeated the whole lump. The desired end will be most speedily and most surely reached, by following along the same lines, and by using every possible means to bring school and college men and women into closer touch and into fuller understanding.

And there is need that they should be brought into closer touch and into more complete cooperation, for there are problems pressing that call for the united wisdom and the united strength of both parties. These problems may be roughly divided into three classes, those that concern the school, those that concern the college or university, and those that concern

both alike. A little reflection will show, however, that each has Pres-
ident's
address an interest in even those problems that seem peculiar to the other.

Of the problems that concern the school, the first that thrusts itself on us is that of the kindergarten. It is with fear and trembling that one ventures on this topic, for he is a brave man who dares to lay profane hands on its sacred mysteries. Let me hasten to assert that I am not attacking the kindergarten. I am simply suggesting with all possible deference, that the last word about the kindergarten has not yet been said, that there is still a problem there to be solved, and a problem not altogether easy of solution.

The problem of the kindergarten is suggested by its results. Of its excellent results when applied to the children of the very poor, often with intellects stunted by improper nourishment and unfavorable surroundings, there seems to be little doubt. In fact, I am not sure but one can say with safety that the kindergarten is admirably adapted to the children of the very poor and of the very rich, whose parents alike, because of ignorance, or because of indifference, because of stress of life or because of social strenuousness, are unable to give them that care and that training that come best from the parent's hand. With the bright, normal child, however, coming from the typical American home, the results in many cases — not all — are such as to rouse serious question.

It is difficult to summarize these results with confidence and accuracy, for it is not easy to tell with certainty how much is due to the child's personality and home training, and one is soon forced to the conclusion that there is as much difference between individual kindergartens as between individual schools of higher grade, or even as between individual colleges. Still, in spite of the difficulty of the case, certain impressions are formulating themselves with growing distinctness in the minds of careful observers. There is an increasing distrust of the physiologic soundness of some of the kindergarten ideas, caused by the many cases of eye strain and nerve irritation that appear to be traced directly to its doors; there is a feeling prevalent that many kindergarten children develop an undue sentimentalism and an

abnormal imagination; and many primary teachers are of the opinion that the children who come to them, while alert and responsive in mind, are lacking in power of continued application and in capacity for independent work. These are no new criticisms, but the number of those who make them is increasing, and they can not be lightly brushed aside.

A little study of the kindergarten, its origin, its theory and its growth throws some light on the subject. Fröbel was a great man, with a keen insight into child nature. He was an educational prophet, with a message of truth and of power, but he was not inspired, and he was not infallible. His pedagogy was better than his philosophy. His educational precepts are often distinctly sounder than the symbolic and mystical ideas on which he bases them. He developed a system of elementary education in many respects admirably adapted to child nature, but curiously permeated with his symbolic ideas. It was a system adapted in its external features to the children with whom he came in contact, stolid German children, largely of the peasant class and from three to five years of age. Now, given a system like this, based on an everlasting truth, but permeated by a questionable and seductive philosophy, and adapted in its external features to children of a particular type, is there not call for unusual judgment and discretion when its comes to developing the system and applying it to children of another race and another temperament? When it is interpreted by immature young women, frequently of the sentimental order, who after a "normal course" of a few brief months are graduated as priestesses of the mystic cult, and when this system, so interpreted, is applied to high strung, nervous American children of 6 and 7, often 2 and sometimes 3 years beyond the kindergarten age, is there any wonder that the results should be what I have said observers find them?

Let me repeat that I am not attacking the kindergarten. I am only trying to save it from its friends. Let me also hasten to add that there are kindergartens and kindergartens, and that the results are not all alike. My object is simply to raise the question whether the kindergarten enthusiasm has not outrun itself,

whether there is not good reason for feeling that the development of the kindergarten in this country has been too rapid for normal, healthy growth, and whether the problem thus raised is not one that in its solution calls for the highest and the best educational thought of the country?

Akin to the problem of the kindergarten is that of the elementary school course of study. There seems to be a growing belief in the omnipotence of education. Every fault in our individual and collective nature is ascribed to defective education, and the weaknesses of heredity and environment that the kindergarten does not profess to overcome are calmly turned over to the school to remedy. When one stops to combine and collate the various theories propounded in our newspapers, at our mothers clubs, and at our teachers institutes, one is filled with awe.

It is not enough that the child should learn to handle skilfully the tools of all learning — the three R's; his sense of form and his esthetic nature must be developed by drawing; his hand must be trained by manual work; his musical nature must be awakened by song; he must be brought into harmony with his external environment by means of nature lessons and the study of science; his patriotic impulse must be roused by the study of American history and by flag drills; temperance must be instilled into him by lessons in physiology with special reference to the effects of alcohol on the human system; his imagination must be cultivated by means of acquaintance with Greek and Norse mythology; he should gain some knowledge of the great heroes and events of general history; through the plentiful reading of masterpieces he should acquire a love for and an appreciation of the best literature, while at the same time his mind should be stocked with choice gems of prose and poetry that will be a solace and a comfort to him throughout his later life; it will be well if, by displacing a little arithmetic or geography, he can gain some knowledge of the elements of Latin or of a modern language; in some manner there should be roused in him a love for trees, a respect for birds, an antipathy to cigarettes, and an ambition for clean streets; and somewhere, somewhere in this wild chaos, he must learn to spell! All these things, together with sewing, cooking,

President's address

carpentry, principles of morality and gymnastic exercise, can easily be acquired in the grammar grades, provided only we have good teaching and proper economy of effort. Do you wonder that sometimes teachers in progressive schools confide to us that they fear their pupils are slightly bewildered? Do you wonder that pupils do not gain the habit and the power of concentrated, consecutive work?

I am drawing no fancy sketch. Every one of these claims that I have catalogued, you have heard made, in all seriousness; you have heard them greeted with applause; and you have seen special associations organized to further each one of them. Am I not right in saying that there is a pressing problem here, a problem too serious to be left to mothers clubs, or to educational enthusiasts? These problems of the kindergarten and the elementary curriculum concern mainly the schools, but they are fundamental. Each step in education conditions that which follows, and the university is affected by the kindergarten. They are school problems, but they need for their adequate solution the highest and the best thought in the whole educational field.

Besides these problems of the school there are certain problems of the college or of the university that thrust themselves on our attention. First of these is perhaps the question of technical and professional schools. Engineering in its various forms has developed with amazing rapidity during the last 20 or 30 years. The profession has steadily grown in dignity, in influence and in opportunity; it has called for a constantly increasing number of men, and it has steadily raised the standard of attainment necessary for success. The natural result has been the rapid growth and development of engineering schools, that has been such a marked feature of modern educational progress. Like every such rapid growth it has been marked by confusion and lack of unity. We have engineering schools calling for little more preparation than can be acquired by a year in a good high school, we have those whose standard of admission is fairly comparable to that of the ordinary college course, and we have some that call as a prerequisite for two or three years of collegiate work or their equivalent. The courses offered are equally diverse. In some the entrance requirements are fairly commensurate with the diffi-

culty of the course; in others they are absolutely misleading. In ^{President's} ~~any~~ address some any student of fair ability working with reasonable industry can expect to earn his degree, but in others no one but a mature student, of more than average ability, and of robust health, can hope to go through without breaking down. In some the studies are exclusively technical, while in others there is some semblance, at least, of a more general culture. Perhaps this diversity is wise; possibly there is need for work according to all these varying standards, but on the surface the diversity appears to be haphazard rather than of settled plan. At least, there appears to be a problem here, and a problem that should not be solved by the university alone, but that calls on the one hand for the aid of the engineering profession, which uses the finished product, and on the other for that of the school, which supplies the raw material.

Akin to this is the question of the status of the other professional schools, specially those of law and medicine. Is the tendency to elevate many of these into purely graduate schools, requiring a bachelor's degree for entrance, wise? Or, if wise and desirable, is it feasible for more than the very few? The question is a broad one, and one in which the schools have more than a passing interest. It means a great deal to us whether a considerable percentage of our pupils are to be prepared directly for professional study or whether a college course is to intervene.

A somewhat different problem, but yet akin, and even more vital at the moment, is that of the length of the college course. I have no intention of discussing this question, tempting as is the opportunity, but it will not be amiss to call attention to one or two considerations that are sometimes overlooked. The problem is one that is forced on the college; the proposal of a shortened course is not the result of seeking for some new thing, but is born of a desire to remedy an existing condition. The quantitative and qualitative increase of college requirements on the one hand, and the steadily growing demands of professional study on the other, have so lengthened the time needed for preparation for law and medicine that the age of beginning one's life work is forced up to an unreasonable point. Three results follow.

Some men begin the practice of their professions too late in life, some skip the college altogether, going straight from the secondary to the professional school; and some are turned aside from the professions of their choice by their inability or unwillingness to give the time needed for full preparation. Similar results follow in the case of those destined for business, and no one knows better than the schoolmaster how many a man is turned aside from a college course by what seems to him its inordinate length. Two proposals are before us to remedy the difficulty. One is squarely to shorten the college course to three years; and in so far as this is a compensation for the abnormally increased admission requirements, the plan is at least logical. The other proposal is to cut the present college course in half, and either to give the bachelor's degree at the end of two years, or to allow the beginning of professional study at that point, giving the degree two years later. There is an absolute demand, I believe, for such a two year course preparatory to professional study, but I wish to emphasize the point that the establishing of such a course is one thing, and the granting of a degree for it is a very different thing. The one may be imperatively needed, but the other does not necessarily follow. An ordinary school course is not an adequate foundation for professional study, but four years is more time than can be added to the preparation for most students. Unless something like a two years college course is offered, the tendency to skip the college will increase. The immediate effect of this will be a tendency to bolster up and extend the school course so as to afford a more adequate preparation. Here is one of the points at which the school comes into the problem. Any change in the status of college and professional courses has a direct effect on the demands made on the schools. I can not here discuss the question fully, but I wish to enter an emphatic protest against the existing tendency to turn college work over to the schools. We are now doing a large share of freshman work, and the result is not satisfactory enough to warrant an extension. We can do certain things better than the college, but we are not equipped to do college work, and the educational result will be distinctly better if we confine ourselves to our

proper sphere. It will be a sad day for American education if ^{President's address} the dream of certain enthusiasts comes true and the high school supplants the American college, or if the college course is crushed out between the upper and the nether millstones.

The problems thus far mentioned are generally regarded as peculiar respectively to the school or to the college, but I have tried to indicate how each is concerned in the problems of the other. The greatest weakness in American education is the way in which it is chopped up into distinct sections, with untrimmed ends that leave ragged gaps between. If the education of a boy or girl is a continuous process, what affects one step in the process affects the whole. The training in the earliest years conditions to a greater or less extent the work in the latest, and we of the schools, therefore, have the right to call on the wisdom and influence of the universities to aid us in making that early training more efficient. College and professional courses directly affect and are affected by secondary school work, and no solution of their problems will be adequate which ignores that fact. The workers in no stage of education have any right to say, "This is our province, where we will work our own will."

There are some questions, however, which so directly affect both school and college that no argument is needed to show that they are joint problems, to be settled only by joint discussion and joint action. The first of these questions is that of uniformity of entrance requirements. The principle of uniformity does not necessarily demand that all colleges shall require the same subjects for admission, but it does demand that, when a college requires a particular subject, its requirement in that subject shall not be materially different from the requirements of other colleges in the same subject. We of the schools insist that one class in any subject should be able to prepare its members equally well for all colleges requiring that subject. This appears to be a reasonable proposition, and the intellectual acceptance of it is now quite general on the part of the colleges, though there are still some that are unwilling to sacrifice that precious possession which they call their "individuality." But, if the principle of uniformity is generally accepted as a sound proposition, much

is yet left to be desired in its application. There has been a distinct gain in the last eight years, but the goal has not yet been reached, and we see no immediate danger of that dead level of monotony that some appear to fear. For instance, we have a uniform entrance requirement in English, but a study of the English papers set in various colleges shows that there is no uniform interpretation of that requirement. Harvard maintains a set of requirements distinctly at variance with those of other institutions, and among other colleges there is a diversity in details that is at times disheartening.

I admit the difficulty of the case. The principle is not always easy of application in detail. If several colleges differ in regard to any requirement, to which one shall the others conform? It is a case for sinking of individual preference, for cooperation, for united action. The College Entrance Examination Board now offers what many of us believe to be a practical solution of the difficulty, and the growth of its work in the last two years indicates that this belief is well founded. I am not now arguing, however, for the examination board, or for any particular plan. I am simply trying to show that the desired uniformity of entrance requirements has not yet been fully attained, and can be fully attained only by the cooperation and united action of the colleges and schools of the country.

The second problem that concerns college and school alike is that of options in entrance requirements. There was a time when the question was, "Shall there be any option at all?" Two of the oldest and largest colleges in the East still allow, in their academic departments, no option whatever, except a choice between French and German, so that the question still exists in its old form. With a few exceptions like these, however, the principle of choice has been admitted, and the question has now become, "How far? To what extent shall options be allowed?" Is the true position that of Yale and Princeton, which insist on Greek as an absolute essential? Is it that of the colleges which hold to the Latin and mathematics, but allow a choice between Greek and modern subjects? Are Columbia and Cornell right in opening the door to students without either Latin or Greek?

Or shall we go still farther, and throw in our lot with that Western university of which it has been said that a man "may select his own entrance requirements, choose his own studies when admitted, remain as long as he likes, and pick his own degree when he decides to graduate"? It is beyond all question, I think, that there is an imperative demand for some freedom of choice, a demand to which even the most conservative must yield, but there is a serious question whether that freedom of choice may not be, and has not been, in some instances, carried too far. The problem is not a simple one; it is entangled with that of the elective system in school and college, and it is complicated by the chaotic condition of college and school courses throughout the country. It is not a dead issue, though some institutions seem to think that they have settled it. It is a live problem and one that should be solved by the joint wisdom and experience of secondary and higher institutions.

A third problem of joint interest is that of the method of admission to college — shall it be by certificate of the school or shall it be by examination? Or, is there possible a combination of the two methods, by which the school shall certify as to the ground covered, and the college shall give a modified examination, designed to test thoroughness and power? The question has been discussed before you today, and I content myself, therefore, with simply stating it as one of the still unsettled problems.

There is only one other problem that I shall mention, but that is one that has not yet received the general attention and consideration that it deserves. This is the question as to the amount of work that shall be required for admission to college. It is not easy to make a general statement on this point, because the requirements of different colleges vary as much quantitatively as they do qualitatively. For instance, it is not an exaggeration to say that there is nearly if not quite a year's difference in the work called for by reputable colleges of good standing in New England and the Middle states. Still, in spite of this difference it is possible to generalize with some accuracy, for the work of college preparation is largely conditioned by the higher requirements.

President's address

One fact appears to be generally admitted. That is that the age of college entrance is now too high. We are told that the responsibility for this rests with the schools, partly with the secondary schools because of improper economy of effort, partly with the elementary schools because of not sending up pupils early enough or well enough prepared. Unquestionably there is an element of truth in this charge, but careful study has convinced me, and I am prepared to maintain the position, that it is at best only a half truth, and that a large share of the responsibility for the existing state of affairs rests with the colleges, which have forced their requirements to an unreasonable point. We have to deal with boys and girls as the good Lord made them, or rather as their parents brought them into the world, for many of their limitations and shortcomings should be ascribed to their parents, rather than to the Lord. We are not dealing with ideal or exceptional, but with actual and average pupils, if there is such a thing as an average boy or girl. Every school of any size has sent to college pupils of 16 or under, and these have probably been among their best graduates, but in those same schools the average age is up to the normal, and every one of them is constantly dealing with pupils who are either physically or mentally too immature to meet the college requirements at 17, or even at 18. The fact is that the average pupil has too many subjects, and too much of each subject, for his mental digestion. The work would be better done, and the pupil would be better prepared for college, if the demands were less. In the best public and private preparatory schools there is a constant pressure that does not conduce to the best educational results. I once expressed surprise to a high school teacher at the amount of work accomplished in the last year of his college preparatory course. His reply was significant. "You forget," said he, "that by our last year we have only the cream of the class left." The number of those in some of our high grade schools who are unable to stand the pace is simply appalling, and college preparation in those schools has become largely a matter of survival of the toughest. The sacrifice is beyond all reason. Now, I submit that where there is such pressure, and such sacrifice, there is something

wrong. Granting that both our elementary and secondary courses are capable of improvement, is the college free from responsibility if, under existing conditions, it makes demands that can be met only by undue pressure or by forcing up the age of entrance? Possibly I have stated the matter too strongly, but I submit that here is a question calling for the closest attention, and for the most searching investigation, and that is distinctly one of the joint problems of school and college.

I have tried to show how much has already been accomplished in securing better relations between our schools and colleges, and at the same time I have tried to point out how much still remains to be achieved. I have tried to indicate some of the problems that are to be solved, and to show that they can be adequately settled only by joint action of the two parties concerned. I plead for closer relations and for heartier cooperation between school and college. I plead for the interest of each in the peculiar problems of the other. I plead for the laying aside of individual preference, of class feeling, of institutional rivalry, and for a union of all our forces to solve the problems that press on us. I make the plea on the ground of the immense importance of the questions involved, and on the broader ground of the unity of education, of hastening the time when the education of the boy and the girl shall be one continuous process from the first day of school life to the awarding of the last degree. I make the plea in no spirit of pessimism or of despair, but, with a full appreciation of what has already been achieved, I urge the laying aside of everything that may retard the present movement, and the union of all our forces to speed the work so auspiciously begun.

Saturday morning, November 29

HOW SHOULD THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION PAPER IN HISTORY BE CONSTRUCTED?

PROFESSOR LUCY M. SALMON, VASSAR COLLEGE, CHAIRMAN OF THE
HISTORY EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

A homely old adage runs, "Any fool can ask questions it takes a wise man to answer." It would perhaps be unreasonable to give as its converse, "A wise man is needed to ask questions a fool can answer"; yet it is not far from the truth to say that

Construc-
tion of
entrance
examina-
tion paper
in history

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

the phrase in this form is more in harmony with present educational conditions than is the original saying. Every conscientious instructor knows that one of his most difficult tasks is the preparation of examination questions, and that there are times when he is tempted to think that the results of an examination as shown in the papers of his students are far from commensurate with the efforts he has himself put forth to prepare a reasonable set of questions.

The difficulties inherent in making out an examination paper are enhanced by the diversity of opinions as to the purpose of examinations. Among the too numerous survivals of the birch rod period of education is the view held of them by probably the majority of students. In their eyes examinations are a species of intellectual torture invented by their natural foes—their instructors, who take fiendish delight when its application has resulted in the overthrow of the innocents. This view of examinations has been handed down by tradition, it has often been fostered by the unreasonable attitude of many instructors themselves, and it flourishes in full vigor everywhere among the student body.

Even among instructors two diametrically opposite views prevail. One class holds that examinations are a test of what the pupil actually knows or does not know, and that the pupil is to stand or fall by the application of this test; that they are to be used as an intellectual ferule to be held over the heads of the pupils; that they are a desirable means of facilitating what has been called "the corkscrew process of extracting information"; that they have the same relation to the scheme of education that the dogma of eternal punishment has in a system of theology, and that they are designed as a punishment for sins of omission committed by the idle, the lazy, the unwary, the indifferent, the mischievous, the stupid, the ignorant, the wilful, the disobedient—and in the eyes of the teachers holding these views the great majority of pupils are to be classed under one or all of these heads.

Another class of instructors holds that examinations are an indispensable part of education; that as the review sums up and

clinches the daily work, so the examination sums up and clinches the review, and thus brings to a focus the work of an entire semester or year; that, as the ascent of a mountain is best made by a winding road that constantly doubles on itself till the summit is reached, so the review doubles on the daily work till the survey of the whole field is presented through the examination; that thus the examination should be anticipated with the same keen zest as the traveler anticipates the view from the summit of the mountain; or, to change the figure, that, as a person who has had a course of lectures on "first aid to the injured" but can not apply what he has learned to cases of accident has gained nothing by such a study, so the examination is not only a test of knowledge but a test of the person's ability to use knowledge.

It was with the latter theory of the nature and purpose of examinations that the examiners began the preparation of the entrance examination paper in history. It may aid the elucidation of the subject to state somewhat in detail just what was done.

As soon as the examiners were selected, entrance question papers in history were secured from all the leading colleges and universities in the country, and these were carefully examined. The examiners then met and agreed on a general plan to be followed in preparing the papers for the College Entrance Board. It was decided that each examiner should prepare a set of questions for each part of the examination in history, since it was believed that the final paper should have an organic unity that could not be secured if parts of it were farmed out among the three examiners. The examiners subsequently met, and in three conferences, averaging four hours each, every question was critically examined, and the papers as a whole provisionally passed on. The resulting papers were then gone over by the chief examiner, and every question was tested by reference to the textbooks most generally used. Every one was thrown out or modified that could not be answered by a pupil who had used these books, except in a few instances where timeliness or other reasons led to the retention of certain questions as options in groups. The

Construction of entrance examination paper in history question on Alfred the Great, for example, could not have been well answered by a pupil who had used the ordinary textbook, but it was retained as an option with the thought that many schools had doubtless given special attention to the subject during the preceding year, and that such special timely work should be encouraged. After this revision, the papers were submitted to the coexaminers, and final criticisms asked. The papers were again revised and submitted to the board of chief examiners in New York city, and the criticisms and suggestions there received were embodied in the final copy sent to the secretary of the board.

In the preparation of the questions the second year, the examiners were able to avail themselves of the experience of the readers of the first year, and this was an invaluable aid. At the close of the examinations of the first year, the chief reader, Prof. Frederick Robertson Jones, submitted an elaborate report in regard to the questions and the resulting answers, and this was supplemented by an exhaustive personal letter sent the chief examiner by Mr W. H. Shepard, one of the coreaders. This criticism was of the greatest service in the preparation of the questions for the current year. In a similar way, the present year, Professor Jones has placed on file for the benefit of future examiners an exhaustive report of 80 manuscript pages, accompanied by the very detailed reports of the coreaders, Dr Shotwell of Columbia, and Mr Robins of Riverview Academy. It may well be questioned whether any set of history papers ever prepared in this country has been given so microscopic an examination, and subjected to so thorough, searching and analytic a criticism. Could the results of the experiences of the readers be given the teachers in the secondary schools, the benefits should be as great and as many as they undoubtedly will prove to be for future examiners.

This detailed statement of the way in which the history paper has been prepared has been given, not to invite the laconic observation of the editor to a writer who had expatiated on the pains he had taken with his ms — that what the proffered article lacked was not perspiration but inspiration, but to indicate that the examiners have at least used all possible care in the preparation

of the paper, that they have believed that the result of their work should be organic in character, and that each examiner should be ready to explain the principles that determined the incorporation of every question in the final paper.

What have been these principles? They may be stated first negatively. The examiners have sought to avoid:

1 Questions that are not questions, e. g. "Julius Caesar," "The second triumvirate," etc.

2 Questions that can be answered by simply "yes" or "no"; e. g. "Has the legendary history of Rome any value?"

3 Questions implying the answer; e. g. those ending "If so, why?"

4 Questions that may be answered by a fortunate guess or the answer to which seems comparatively unimportant; e. g. "When did the Reign of Terror end?"

5 Indefiniteness; e. g. "Give some, etc., " "Discuss a few, etc., " "Mention the chief, etc."

6 Questions involving unrelated points; e. g. "Give the political life of Alfred the Great. Give the important provisions of Magna Charta."

7 Generalizations involving a premature judgment based on an insufficient command of facts; e. g. "The effects of Alexander's conquests on civilization."

8 Generalizations beyond the probable reasoning powers of the candidate; e. g. "Give your estimate of Athenian democracy."

9 Questions encouraging on the part of the candidates undue confidence in their own judgment; e. g. "What are the possible annexations to the territory of the United States? Do you regard the acquisitions of any of these possessions as desirable?"

10 Questions that are not primarily historical; e. g. "What is the philosophic basis of asceticism?"

11 Questions that, however admirable for an oral quiz, seem less desirable for a written examination; e. g. "Name five cities occupied by the British during the Revolution. Name five British generals. Name five American generals, etc."

12 Dragnet questions; e. g. "Write a page on what you know about the history of your own state."

Construction of
entrance
examina-
tion paper
in history

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

All of these questions are concrete examples and have been taken from the entrance examination papers of different colleges and universities. They are the questions we have all written at the close of the college year when every hour has seemed to carry a first and a second mortgage, and when we have been tempted to close our sets of papers with the time honored questions, "Who immortalized some spot in Italy?" and "Who chased whom how many times around the walls of what?"

In a word, the examiners sought to avoid on one hand the centrifugal force that tends toward a multiplicity of questions of detail which no secondary school pupil could be or should be expected to know, and on the other hand to avoid the centripetal force that tends toward broad, meaningless, unsupported generalizations; they have sought the perfect circle, but they realize far more than any one else the angles and tangents of the resulting product.

But the negative pole of the battery must find its complement in the positive pole; and, though the examiners might plead with Portia that they could easier teach 20 what were good to be done, than be one of the 20 to follow their own teaching, they felt that it was necessary to state in a positive as well as a negative way the principles that should govern an examination paper.

Stated on the positive side, therefore, the examiners have considered it the purpose of the examination:

- 1 To ascertain what definite information the candidates have on undisputed historical questions.
- 2 To test the ability of the candidates to deduce conclusions from facts.
- 3 To test the knowledge of the candidates of the facts on which their own generalizations or those of others are based.
- 4 To test the candidates in regard to their powers of observation, analysis, imagination, reasoning and judgment as shown in their work in history.
- 5 To connect as far as possible the history of one country with that of another.
- 6 To connect as far as possible the work in history with the work in other subjects.

7 To emphasize at every point the idea of the continuity of history.

8 To give the fullest possible latitude to the candidates to show what interest they have taken in their work during the time they have been preparing for college.

9 To reduce to a minimum the opportunities for passing the examination through cramming for it.

To attain these results, two methods of examination presented themselves — the first, to arrange sets of questions that should follow out the chronological development of history; the second, to violate chronological sequence in order to secure certain tests otherwise impossible. The advantages of the topical method of examination seemed to outweigh those of the purely chronological arrangement, and the questions were therefore made out according to this plan, but the chronological order was, as a rule, observed within groups of questions, though in some cases the arrangement of a series of questions was alphabetic.

The matter in regard to which questions were to be asked was in general classified under the heads of art, bibliography, biography, commerce, geography, legislation, literature, manufactures, politics, religion, war, and various similar headings.

The attempt was made so to frame the questions on these subjects as to test the candidates in accuracy and definiteness of statement, their ability to make comparisons, to draw conclusions, and to form judgments; their knowledge of the historic origin of current phrases and their understanding of allusions in literature to historic events; and in other, kindred ways to show that they have a certain definite knowledge of historic facts, that the acquiring of this knowledge has given them a certain amount of mental training, and that they are able to apply both this knowledge and this training to other subjects.

The examiners also believed that to a limited extent processes should be considered; and therefore a few groups of questions were prepared under the headings: outlines, narration, description, quotations etc. The current year, while the same idea has been maintained, it has been made less prominent in the headings; for example, all the quotations in Roman history were

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

Construction of entrance examination paper in history placed under the heading "The Romans and the Germans"; and, as these quotations were selected from four different periods when the two peoples came in contact with each other, they thus indicated an outline history of the topic.

This was the educational creed adopted and in accordance with which the history papers for two years have been made out. That the task set the examiners was no light one, no one understood better than the examiners themselves. The questions were expected to satisfy the colleges that were giving up their own examinations, to satisfy the schools that had prepared the candidates, to satisfy the candidates themselves, to satisfy the parents of the candidates, to satisfy the College Entrance Board, to satisfy the Board of Chief Examiners, to satisfy the readers, and finally the most difficult of all, to satisfy the examiners themselves.

The papers have not escaped criticism; it was not only expected that they would not do so, but criticism from every possible quarter has been sought by the examiners and by the secretary of the board. Much, therefore, has come to the knowledge of the examiners. Some of the criticisms of the papers have been flippant; some have been based on an erroneous idea as to the purpose of an examination; some have come from teachers whose pupils have signally failed to pass the examination; others have emanated from superintendents and principals who have assigned the work in history in their schools to the teacher of science, or to the teacher of gymnastics, or to the teacher of drawing, painting and biology; some have come from college professors who "have never set that kind of a paper"; still others have come from colleges whose past conception of history is perhaps indicated by the abstract from the catalogue for 1900-1 of a large university, apropos of entrance examinations in history: "Students are urged, instead of verbally memorizing any one textbook, to supplement a careful reading of the text by as wide a range of connected reading as their circumstances will permit." All objections coming from such sources may be dismissed as the vagaries of incompetent and prejudiced minds.

But honest, serious questions have been asked, and criticisms

have been offered, by those to whose sound judgment the examiners have always deferred, and these criticisms and objections must be frankly met and, if possible, answered.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

What are the objections to be seriously considered? The first concerns the question of options. It has been urged against options that they are confusing, that the candidate wastes time in reading them, and that the test is not the same for all where choice is given.

It must be said, in support of the principle of options adopted by the examiners, that it seems practically impossible to ask the same questions without options when those taking the examinations have been prepared in hundreds of different schools, by hundreds of different teachers all over the country. We have no rigid system of education; each school is practically a law unto itself as regards curriculum and textbooks. As long as this flexibility everywhere prevails, it is necessary to have a corresponding flexibility in the questions set. Pupils prepared in different schools, by different teachers, studying different textbooks, reading different collateral references, must have a choice of questions in a subject having so wide a range of interests as that denominated history.

Second, it is urged, and the objection is presented with great force and clearness by Professor Jones, that all the questions within groups should be perfectly balanced, that, if this is not done, the candidates will answer on the line of least resistance, and the more difficult questions in the group could thus better be left out; that a group of questions is just as strong as the weakest of the subquestions within the group; that, if a group of these options contains two hard questions and one easy one, the two strong questions are mere ornaments and mislead others into believing that the group of questions is a fairly difficult one; that it would be far better to offer no choice at all than to offer one between one easy question and two difficult ones in the same group.

There is much force in this reasoning; yet it must be said on the other hand that, desirable as is a perfect balancing of groups and of subquestions within a group, it is not necessary to the

Construction of entrance examination paper in history success of an examination that this absolute balance be maintained. It is true that the majority of candidates will answer the easiest question within a group; but it is also probably true that more students are graduated from college on a percentage of 75 than of 95. It is true that pupils will follow the line of least resistance; but no college or school requires that its students or pupils attain a uniform percentage for graduation — some colleges graduate their students on all percentages from 60 to 100, others grant the degree on percentages varying from 75 to 100. It is true that a chain is as strong as its weakest link, but, if the weakest link does not give way, the chain holds. It must also be remembered that the balancing of questions within groups has two aspects. The readers naturally desire to have the questions properly balance, while the examiners desire rather to have the questions balance — they wish to approach one idea from different sides, to develop a certain subject, to look at a question from several points of view. Thus the group of questions on the English, Spanish and French colonization of America was, from the reader's point of view, a poor one because one half of the candidates answered the question on the pre-Columbian discoveries, and only one fourth attempted that on the French explorations. From the examiners' point of view the questions were well balanced, since they suggested three different classes of early explorers.

Third, the criticism is made that on the papers certain great fields of history have been passed over, for example, that the American history paper of 1901 had no question on exploration and discovery, that the English history paper of 1902 omitted questions relating to internal history, that questions on bibliography have not been asked, etc.

It may be said in reply to this objection, that the field of history is so broad that it is impossible to cover even one section of it, as ancient history, in a series of 10 questions. A selection of questions to be asked must be made by the examiners as well as a selection of questions to be answered by the candidates. Moreover, if the same groups are asked every year, the papers soon become stereotyped, and the examination

perishes of dry rot. Something too must be done to counteract the impression that only those topics are to be taught and studied that will probably be called for on the examination.

Fourth, it is urged, and specially by one of the readers of 1901, that questions on biography, and to a certain extent those calling for facts illustrating given quotations, are, in general, useless, since the answers to such questions are replete alike with "gassing" and "guessing"; that, while the answers may have revealed a wondrous imaginative temperament, the historical knowledge shown was scant.

It may be said in reply that, granting that the questions were not well answered, the fault may not have lain altogether with the questions — a part of the responsibility rests with the teachers and with the candidates. There is certainly opportunity for indefiniteness, vagueness, guessing and various other characteristics little to be desired in answers to definite questions, if pupils have had no training in answering questions of that kind. But biography enters so largely into history that it can not be ignored, and every year more and more attention is paid in the schools to the study of the undisputed facts in the lives of great men, and there is a corresponding decrease in the number of the crude generalizations in regard to character and motives that once filled our textbooks.

Fifth, objection has been raised to questions calling for comparison on the ground that secondary school pupils do not understand the term and are unfamiliar with the processes of thought involved in comparison; that they usually give an account of one of the parts called for by the comparison, followed by a similar account of the other part, but make no attempt to point out features of similarity or of dissimilarity; that the comparisons attempted are usually ridiculous; that they afford the pupil an excellent opportunity of running riot, and that he usually accepts the opportunity; that "he will frequently write several pages of the veriest rot and go away with a self-satisfied feeling of having gotten at least that question right."

To this it must be said that the fault again perhaps does not lie so much with the questions as with the training of the can-

Construction of
entrance
examina-
tion paper
in history

Construction of entrance examination paper in history didates. That training in comparison is desirable will perhaps be generally admitted; many historians from Plutarch to Bryce have used most effectively this method of making vivid the evolution of the present from the past. Professor Gilder-sleeve's comparison of the Greeks and the Americans is remembered by all as a classic. Mr Bryce's more recent comparisons of certain phases of Roman and British rule are among the most subtle and profound of modern historical studies. If the younger generation is to continue this work, training for it must be given.

But entirely apart from the value of comparison in the training of historians, a number infinitesimally small in comparison with the total number of pupils studying history, it must be generally admitted that comparison in and of itself is a valuable exercise. To find points of contact, to discover resemblances and differences, to find a common origin in conditions seemingly diverse, to study relations, to do all this is to give definiteness and clearness of thought. "We can never understand anything well but by comparing it with something else," says James Freeman Clarke, while Huxley calls comparison "the essence of every science."

It seems therefore unwise to give up all efforts to draw out comparisons through questions, even though the results obtained are as yet crude and unsatisfactory. Better teaching and better textbooks will remedy the evil, and it seems unwise to abandon the field to the poor teacher, to the inferior textbook and to the resulting ill prepared pupil, by withdrawing altogether this group of questions.

Sixth, it is said that pupils can not, at least do not, distinguish between question groups headed "outline," "narration" and "description"; that these questions are practically answered in the same way, and that the answers are prolix, verbose and meaningless.

This is undoubtedly true; but here again it may be said that defective training in English, rather than the questions, is in a measure responsible for the unsatisfactory results. Improvement in work in English ought to show good results all along

the line. On the other hand, it will undoubtedly be wise to emphasize these classifications less and less each year.

Seventh, objection has been raised to the plan of asking questions that should connect the work done in history with that done in other subjects, as in Latin, Greek or English; that, as one head master of a great school has put it, "no boy wants to be hung twice from the same tree."

This objection, one can but feel, indicates a shortsighted, erroneous conception of education on the part of those raising it. "The unification of knowledge is the very secret and essence of all education, from its lowest to its highest forms," says Prof. James Seth of Edinburgh. The intellectual awakening of many a boy or young man dates from the hour when he first realizes that Caesar's *Commentaries* were not written for the purpose of teaching indirect discourse, that French is but a tool to be used in the study of many subjects, and that history is written in Greek and in German as well as in English. It was therefore deep conviction of its value as an educational principle that led the examiners to attempt to connect history with other subjects and to connect different periods of history with each other in order to show the continuity of history itself.

These are the most important objections raised to the questions as far as knowledge of them has reached the examiners. That future examiners will be able to profit much by them is certain.

The task of the examiners and of the readers in history, onerous as it has been, has had its compensations. What the examiners have themselves learned of history through the questions and through the suggestions of friendly critics, like Prof. G. L. Burr of Cornell, has been an interesting by-product, perhaps not contemplated when the appointments were made by the central board. The diversion found by the readers was in turn not anticipated by the examiners when they asked the questions that called forth the information, that the "omnibus bill provided that negroes were to ride in omnibuses on the same footing as whites"; that "the omnibus bill was the bill into which all those things which were needed at the time

Construction of
entrance
examina-
tion paper
in history

Construction of entrance examination paper in history were put"; that "the Mason and Dixon line was the line north of which corn whiskey could not be sold"; that "the free-soilers were land-grabbers. They were Democrats who believed in giving Mexico all she wanted. The outcome showed the true American spirit—we are bound to have what we want."

If one of the examiners in history believes heartily in the admission of students to college by examination, if another believes in the certificate system, and if a third believes in admission to college neither by examination nor by certificate, but by the system of accredited schools, then the preparation of questions for admission to college by examination has, for the majority of the examiners in history, been indeed a case of greatness thrust on them. In any event, they have believed that the office of examiner is one held in trust to this body, and they have welcomed this opportunity of giving an account of their stewardship.

Dr James Sullivan — There are six persons concerned in the making of the college entrance examination paper in history. These are, on the college side, the examiner, the reader, and the president of the college; and on the side of the school, the teacher, the pupil, and the head of the school.

It sometimes happens that the examiner is one of the youngest instructors in the college, with little or no experience in framing questions; and, where the burden of making the examination falls on one of the older members of the history department, there is possibly too little attention paid to getting thoroughly good and suitable questions. It does not follow that, because a man is a great scholar, he is a good examiner. In fact, one of the greatest scholars in Oxford is the very poorest examiner.

The readers are frequently the youngest instructors, and in many cases are graduate students, whom a money consideration, and not an interest in the subject, draws to the work. This, however, is not such a serious defect, if the work is thoroughly supervised by an older member of the department. It is much to be regretted that sometimes the head of the department or the president of the college feels the need of setting some percentage of failures which should not be exceeded, or, if not actually

doing this, at least makes the readers feel that they have rejected too many candidates. The standard of teaching in the secondary school will never be raised while such methods are pursued.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

The teachers in the secondary schools are naturally anxious to see as many as possible of their pupils pass the examination. No matter how good the teacher, he is bound to degenerate into a mere crammer if the aim of his teaching is to get his pupils through the examinations as now set.

The principals of preparatory schools are interested in seeing a large number of their pupils enter college, and their judgment of a teacher's work is influenced by the number of candidates who pass the examination. Some principals figure out the percentages of passes and failures in their schools and compare them with those attained by other schools. The teacher who is not successful in getting a large number of his boys through, no matter how good he may be in imparting information in a way to develop the powers of judgment and reason, will certainly not be retained by the head of the school. The candidate for entrance wants to get through his examination, and he does not wish to gain any training which may develop general ability, but which does not fill him with the necessary facts by drill and reviews to enable him to pass.

The question of the advisability or nonadvisability of the examination system does not enter here. I believe that examinations can be set which will reduce cramming to a minimum, and by the results of which teaching may be judged. By the results of examinations as now set, however, I do not think this is possible.

The committee appointed by various associations since 1892 have realized that there is some serious defect in the teaching of history. In the reports of the Madison conference in 1892, the committee of seven and the New England History Teachers Association, the most important portions are those on the use of history in developing the powers of judgment and reason. One might naturally expect, that as these committees were made up largely of college instructors, the entrance examinations would show the effect of their recommendations and would contain an

Construction of entrance examination paper in history increasingly larger proportion of questions testing the judgment and reason.

For the purpose of determining whether such were the case or not, I have examined the entrance papers in history since 1893 from 13 colleges in different parts of this country. The questions on these papers may be grouped under the following 11 heads: (1) purely memory; (2) geographic catalogue; (3) date catalogue; (4) term catalogue; (5) comparative; (6) judgment and reason; (7) geography and chronology of the new type; (8) outside reading, optional; (9) outside reading, required; (10) notebook; (11) preparation. Of these only a few require definition. By geographic catalogue is understood a list of places to "locate and tell for what noted;" date catalogue—a list of dates, "tell for what noted;" term catalogue—a list of terms to define. By geography and chronology questions of the new type is meant those questions which bring out a knowledge of geography and chronology in connection with larger questions.

Most of the headings can be disposed of very rapidly. The date catalogue has fortunately almost entirely disappeared. Of about 200 papers which I examined it appeared on three only, but those, curiously enough, were of very recent date. The evils of such a form of question are too obvious to need comment. Optional questions on outside reading appeared on the Harvard papers till 1898, when they were dropped. Beginning with 1900, such questions have appeared on the papers of several of the colleges, and on those of the Examination Board of the Middle States and Maryland. Notebooks have not been called for except at Harvard, and there only since 1900. The geographic catalogue still finds almost universal favor, one question of this kind generally finding a place on the papers of each of the colleges, and the same may be said of the term catalogue. Fortunately the geography and chronology questions of the new type are finding favor, and we may hope to see them supplant altogether the older geographic and chronologic catalogues. The use of comparative questions and those testing the judgment and reason is not at all general, though

most of the colleges have put such on their papers occasionally. The type of question generally used, and used to the exclusion of almost all others, is that which we have designated as the purely memory question. Since the reports of the various committees mentioned above, there has been no observable decrease in questions of this sort. They usually form about 90% of each paper, seldom less than 75%, and often 100%. For this preponderance of the purely memory question there is absolutely no excuse. The colleges have preached one thing and practised another. We all know that it is easier for examiners to find questions testing the memory only than it is to work out good comparative questions and those testing the judgment and reason. The colleges have usually chosen the easier method. Such action on their part can not be too severely condemned.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

It may be urged that all questions are memory questions. That is true enough, but they need not be purely memory. In other words, the candidate may always be required to show his ability, by using the facts which he has learned, to make comparisons and to exercise his judgment and reason. Committees made up largely of college men tell us that history is not a purely memory subject, but that it trains the observation, the judgment and reason; and yet no one would ever know that history was anything but a memory subject, were he to confine his researches to glancing over the college entrance papers of today.

It must be confessed that many teachers in the secondary schools do not wish to see anything but the purely memory questions. These permit of cramming, and that is the kind of teaching they want to do. Poor teachers can cram pupils as well as good teachers, but they can not train the observation, the judgment and the reason half as well. That is a reason for dropping the purely memory question as much as possible from the college paper, for such action will reduce cramming to a minimum, and make necessary an improved standard for history teachers.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

Poor questions, supposed to test ability to make comparisons and to test the judgment and reason, have been set, but this is no cause for a condemnation of good questions of this kind. I feel that a question which calls for the comparison of two great men finds no place on the entrance paper. Some good examples may be found, such as "Compare Blaine with Clay," but in general answers to such questions amount to nothing more than mere word writing, if they amount to that.

There are other faults in the papers even of the last two years besides that of the great preponderance of the purely memory question. There is the stereotyped form of printing the paper. If there is any good reason for not changing the form every year, it has escaped my attention. The geographic catalogue is still present, where it should have been abandoned long ago. Questions of this sort lead the teacher to coach the candidates to memorize stereotyped answers describing the location of a place and giving an important fact about it, while the pupil remains entirely ignorant of its true geographic position on the map, and its real importance in history. The term catalogue is not so bad, but it leads to a similar treatment by the teacher, and, with such treatment, history becomes for the pupil a dictionary of terms and places without any unity.

Some general faults of examinations without regard to any particular kind of question may be summed up as follows. As a rule the examinations are too long, one extreme case having 25 questions to be answered in an hour. Examinations of this sort encourage short answers, and do not lead the teachers to train their pupils to write or to recite at length on any one topic. This extreme length of examinations seems to be due to a feeling on the part of the examiners that their examinations must touch on every point covered by a textbook, or that by giving many questions they may enable the weak candidates to pass.

Questions frequently suggest too much, the following being a common form and good example: "Marius and the Invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones. What successful experiences in warfare had given Marius and his army confidence? What had the invaders done to terrify Italy? Plan of the invasion; tactics and

counterplan of Marius; the victory at Aquae Sextiae; at Ver- Construction of
entrance
examina-
tion paper
in history cellae; what became of the German invaders? When were they avenged?"

We note the same questions occurring again and again in exactly the same words. There seems to be a decided paucity of invention on the part of the examiners in this respect, for, though it is necessary to examine on the same topics, there is no good reason why the phrasing of questions should not be changed. It seems that the examiners, instead of trying to find new questions or new phraseology, content themselves with reproducing at intervals questions which they find on old papers.

It would scarcely be to the point to find so many faults without making some suggestions for improvement. Geographical and chronologic questions should form a part of some larger question. For instance: Trace the career of Hannibal during the Second Punic War, giving the important dates, and locating on the map the places you mention. There should be more questions concerning the effect of environment on the development of peoples. The term catalogue should be used with discretion, and few terms put in one question. This would give the candidate time to explain at some length the terms asked for. As the questions are given now, the candidate has barely time to jot down: Heliaeae—Popular supreme court at Athens; Magna Charta—Document issued by John. Such answers are vicious, because they encourage the student to try to retain only enough about a term or institution to enable him to give a brief definition and no more. Crowding the different terms into one question is due to the same feeling on the part of the examiners which makes them give 25 questions to be answered in an hour. They seem to feel that they are not testing a candidate's knowledge unless they touch every conceivable point. As a matter of fact, one term, "apella" or "ecclesia," will test whether a candidate has done his work well or not.

In line with this same recommendation about the term question is another about the number of questions an hour which a candidate should be called on to answer. Candidates properly prepared should be able to write 20 minutes or longer on a given question and should not find it necessary to have leading steps

Construction of entrance examination paper in history put in the question in order to draw out their information. Suppose, for example, a question reads: "The Second Punic War." A poorly prepared candidate will be at an absolute loss to do much of anything with it, and his poor grade will be his teacher's fault. The pupil should be taught to consider such questions in general under the headings of causes, events and results. It is not the business of the examiners to specify all these things. Further, under the head of each of these divisions, the pupil should be taught to make groups of such headings as political, commercial, military, economic, social, religious. Such groupings, and not events, should be indelibly impressed on the pupil's memory. Any question, no matter of what sort, has its divisions; and pupils should be so taught that, when they are asked for the life of a great man, or the description of some government, they will be able to outline the question in its essential parts and not feel the necessity of having a score of subsidiary questions to bring out their knowledge.

As long as the examiners put their questions with helps for the candidate in the form of numerous side questions, just so long will teachers fail to prepare their pupils to write fully and connectedly on any topic.

The examiners themselves are not always competent, and more attention should be paid by the colleges to their selection. They should be thoroughly familiar with all the good texts used in the schools, and see to it that questions on the examination papers can be answered from those texts. A cooperation between the examiners and the teachers of the secondary schools is highly advisable. As a suggestion, I would ask the examiners to send to the history teachers of the secondary schools requests for questions which they think suitable for the examination papers, and further, that, as far as practicable, the readers of the examination papers be chosen from the secondary school teachers. If this plan were followed, it would form a happy medium between the examination system as it now exists and the accrediting system. We should have examinations set and read by the secondary school teachers under the supervision of the colleges.

Good questions occur to most of us which never appear on the ^{Construction of entrance examination paper in history} examinations; and I am sure the teachers would be only too glad to send them to the colleges. As examples I submit the following:

Compare the grievances of a provincial town under the Roman republic with those of a member of the Delian League.

Compare the strong and weak points in the education of a Roman and an Athenian gentleman.

Contrast the relative advantages of Sicily with the coasts of the Black sea as fields for Greek colonization.

Describe in detail the origin and growth of the elements of the feudal system, and show why the system came into existence and why it died out.

Give an account of the steps in the Reformation taken during Elizabeth's reign, and make clear why it was that she supported protestantism, when she is known to have had leanings toward catholicism.

Describe fully the condition of the people at the North and at the South before the Civil War, and account for their decided differences, when in 1620 they were of the same people and from the same country.

By the use of questions like these, and the insertion of the words "in detail," "at length" and "fully," the examiners will go far toward reducing cramming to a minimum and making possible the statement, which we should all like to hear, that "good teaching may be judged by the results of college entrance examinations."

DISCUSSION

Professor Edward P. Cheyney — I understand my duty to be to call attention to the deficiencies, not to the excellences of the paper which makes the subject of your discussion and of the entrance examination papers which that paper defends. It would be easy to fill my allotted 10 minutes with very sincere expressions of approval of the work of Miss Salmon and her committee. We all owe to her and them a debt of gratitude for their formulation of the problem and of principles, their analysis of conditions, and their suggestive questions. Similarly, I could second many of Dr Sullivan's judicious criticisms and suggestions for

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

much needed improvements. This I wish to acknowledge once for all and disavow any lack of appreciation of the work of the committee and the suggestions of Dr Sullivan. But I am to call attention to those points in which they do not seem to me to have either acted wisely or criticized sufficiently incisively.

My fundamental criticism may be expressed in one word, overrefinement, or perhaps better, overelaboration. In the first place, the papers made out by the committee and defended by Miss Salmon undertake too much. They should not be expected to serve as part of a student's education in history. There are plenty of other opportunities for this, and the circumstances of entrance examinations are not favorable to it. It is no part of the functions of an examiner in history to test the general reasoning powers of a student; to train his general powers of observation and analysis; to try to correlate his knowledge of history with that of other subjects. This is too ambitious a program for two and a half hours in a strange place, under adverse conditions, and with an ulterior object overshadowing all others. Entrance examinations in history must always play a somewhat humble role. They can only be a rough estimate of a student's ability. History is not like mathematics or a language, where an answer is either right or wrong. The question is, how far right, how far wrong? It is a matter of degree of excellence. Again, students can not be expected to have all their historical acquisitions available at any one time. What they have gotten from its study is represented rather in their mental fiber and moral attitude than in their stock of available facts.

An entrance examination in history can at best prove but one thing; that is, whether the pupil has had an intelligent course of teaching and study in the field of history under examination.

A rigid and intelligent reading of his answers is of course required. The examiner should not pass any paper which does not give evidence of intelligent past study on the part of the student; but he should not refuse any which does give it.

Secondly, the papers prepared by the committee are overelaborate because they classify too much. Too much of the skeleton of the paper shows. It is undesirable to divide history into

subsubjects; narration, geography, biography, political development, material development etc. Miss Salmon enumerates "art, biography, commerce, geography, legislation, literature, manufactures, politics, religion, and war." If treated in this way, both teachers and students are apt to get the idea that history is a compound subject made up of many separate subjects, a certain amount of each of which must be learned. History is really one and should be so treated. The papers should be more simple.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

Thirdly, the papers are overelaborate because they tend to drop into stereotyped forms. It must be remembered that papers must be made out every year and year after year. If the questions are to be made out according to a set system, that system will inevitably react on the secondary schools and tend to a stereotyped method of teaching.

This is highly undesirable. In the last analysis, the greatest need in order to get good entrance examinations in history is to get good teachers of history in the schools. Let us not dictate to these teachers too much; not belittle their office; not discourage their experimenting. History teaching in the schools is their problem, not ours. Let them work it out in their own way, with their own lessons of experience and their own rewards for success. A stereotyped examination paper is an interference with this process.

I believe that on the whole it would be better if school teachers and their pupils would forget all about college and college entrance examinations, and bend all their energies to making a good study of the subject for its own sake, without any ulterior object in view. When pupils in school are studying history, the best school course will also be the best college preparatory course. College examiners must not lay down too close directions for school teachers. Hold up a high standard, but do not make it intrusive or require exactly one thing from all.

To sum up, my one criticism of the previous papers is that the entrance examination they advocate undertakes too much. This is so because (1) their ideal is unattainable, (2) it introduces too much subdivision, and (3) it usurps functions which should belong to the secondary school teacher.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

[Prof. Paul Van Dyke, of Princeton University, continued the discussion.]

Dr E. W. Lytle—There is a thought that I wish to express. It has been said that examinations abridge the liberties of teachers. Would it not be better if the liberties of our teachers should be somewhat abridged in these examinations? Is it not a fact that history teachers suffer more from the results of license, from lack of any proper consensus of opinion, than from the abridgment of their liberty, and would it not be well to restrain the liberty of teachers in history examinations? I believe we are suffering from too much liberty.

Dr Henry E. Shephard—[A summary] Dr Shephard concurred with the essential features of Miss Salmon's paper, and continued as follows: It is a just and rational contention that examination questions in history which are capable only of an explicit answer, negative or affirmative, may present more formidable difficulties than those whose range and complexity admit of latitude and discrimination, and bring into requisition the facility of coordination and correlation. He illustrated his thesis by a number of questions propounded from memory, such for example, as, "Which king of England was crowned four times?" "Who was the only American that received a title of nobility from the Holy Roman Empire?" "Which queen of England was crowned in the Island of Cyprus, and was probably never in England?" "Who was the only English pope?" "Who was the first king of England to receive the title of Majesty?" "Which queen of England had five stepmothers?" "Who was the last Holy Roman emperor crowned at Rome?" The list is capable of indefinite extension, but illustrates the character of the questions contemplated.

He found himself in sympathy with Miss Salmon's views in regard to the rare value of comparative study in every sphere of knowledge, specially in the field of history and literature; for literature, in its intensest aim and idea, is the artistic expression of the historic life. He regarded Miss Salmon's reference to the teacher of his early days, Professor Gilder-sleeve, as eminently just and felicitous; for in his catholic and versatile scholarship, there is exhibited a range and rich-

ness of culture such as modern specialization has almost effaced in the rigor and relentlessness of its differentiating methods. He had learned as much English as he did Greek, while a student in Professor Gildersleeve's Greek classes at the University of Virginia.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

Professor Van Dyke's criticisms specially appealed to his sympathies and his judgment. His tribute to the older school of historians, he regarded as thoroughly just and discriminating, and alluded to the stimulating power of Macaulay as a brilliant illustration of the wisdom of his generalization.

Lack of time rendered an elaboration of the speaker's views impossible, and they are presented in the merest outline. He also discussed the most effective modes of developing a rational interest in the study of history, in the special section devoted to this subject; but was unable to present the question adequately in consequence of the limited time at his disposal.

[Dr Julius Sachs, of New York, spoke briefly in support of the paper presented by Miss Salmon, and also of the standards adopted by the examination committee.]

Prof. J. B. Carter—I have listened with great interest to the discussion, and I rise to two points. Dr Sachs has just defended Miss Salmon's paper from the charge of trying to educate the pupil instead of merely examining him. I grant him the defense; but, allowing that to be so, her idea seems to me to be to educate the teacher of the preparatory schools of the country through the paper, in regard to what things they are to teach in history and what methods they are to employ. It seems to me that such a position is fundamentally false, in that it tends to increase the already unhealthfully exaggerated interest which the preparatory schools are taking in the question of examinations. There is much too great a tendency to prepare for examination, rather than to teach a subject. Teach the boy history for its own sake, not merely or even chiefly that he may pass an examination. The preparatory school is a far greater thing than a mere coach for examination. It is an institution which is responsible for the intellectual growth of the boy in the period preceding his college course.

Construction of entrance examination paper in history

My second point is, that Miss Salmon's idea for an examination paper in history seems to prefer judgment questions to memory questions, and hence (according to her device to teach the schools) to emphasize what I believe to be pedagogically false, namely, the attempt to substitute judgment for memory in the pupil. This is contrary to Nature, who has given the pupil a good memory, but allows no judgment. Teach the children facts, make them know things, send them to college with some knowledge. Their history can be taught, ought to be taught philosophically, but it can be so taught only when the preparatory school has given the student this fact. Send us boys who know the fundamental facts, and we will try to teach them to correlate them. But we have no time in our college course to teach both facts and their correlation.

Prof. Charles N. Cobb—I want to call attention to one fact at the close of this discussion, namely, that one of the largest and best known universities in the country has kept a careful tabulation for years with regard to the course in the university, of students entering in different ways, either by examination or by certificate. The result in that university is overwhelmingly in favor of the students entering on examinations not set by that university.

Prof. Sidney T. Moreland—The result of this discussion seems to be, that there ought to be an examination of history in the secondary schools, and that the teacher should lose sight of the fact that the examination is for the purpose of entrance into the college. I can not see how the teacher can be free in these examinations, if he knows his work is to be tested by somebody else. It seems to me, that the teacher of the secondary school, who has taught the student in history, knows himself best whether the student knows any history or not.

Miss Eleanor L. Lord—The criticism has just been made that, in spite of the stress laid by the committee of seven on the fact that history is not a mere memory exercise, a disproportionate number of questions that merely test the memory still appear on the entrance papers set by the colleges.

I would suggest in answer to this that history deals obviously with facts, and that it seems to be impossible to render these

data available for future use without the aid of the memory. Miscellaneous business Moreover, it is generally conceded to be a truth of psychology that in early youth the memory is more easily trained than in later life, when the power of judgment is more appropriately developed; the immature mind handles the concrete more readily than the abstract. It would seem, therefore, that if the facts of history, whether geographic, or chronologic or what not are to become a part of the student's mental furniture, the preparatory school is the most appropriate place for insistence on definite, accurate knowledge of the undisputed facts of history. I take it that the committee of seven did not intend to recommend that memorization should be entirely eliminated, but that, while examination papers should not be overloaded with questions of such a nature as to encourage cramming, a fair proportion should be allowed to such questions as test the accuracy and definiteness of the student's knowledge, as well as his power to draw comparisons and deduce conclusions from authenticated data.

A college instructor dealing with freshman classes ought to be able to presuppose just such definiteness of historical knowledge, and not be forced to take time for the sort of training that should have been afforded by the preparatory school as a foundation for that cultivation of the powers of analysis and synthesis that specially differentiates collegiate from secondary school instruction in history.

Properly to adjust the proportion of memory questions in an examination paper to questions that test the power of judgment probably requires "special grace," and the ideal examiner, like the ideal teacher, is evidently born and not made; but it is this very nicety of balance which, it seems to me, must be the aim of those who are concerned with the admission to college of candidates in history.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS¹

Friday morning. The president announced the appointment of the following temporary committees:

Auditing committee. Dr J. E. Gilpin, of Johns Hopkins University; and Principal Samuel C. Fairley, of the Granger Place School, Canandaigua N. Y.

¹ For reports submitted at the Friday afternoon session, and action thereon, see p. 47-51

Miscel-
laneous
business

The committee on nominations. President A. V. V. Raymond, of Union University; Dean Griffin, of Johns Hopkins University; Principal James M. Green, of the New Jersey State Normal School; Head Master James L. Patterson, of Chestnut Hill School, Philadelphia; and President Edward M. Gallaudet, of Gallaudet College, Washington D. C.

Saturday morning. The president called for the report of the treasurer, which is as follows:

Treasurer's report

To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

I present herewith my report as treasurer of your association for the year 1901-2, with the customary itemized statement and vouchers:

Receipts

Balance in the treasurer's hands Nov. 29, 1901.....	\$285 65
Received membership dues for 1897-98 from one school	5 ..
Received membership dues for 1898-99 from two schools	10 ..
Received membership dues for 1899-1900 from three schools	15 ..
Received membership dues for 1900-1 from six schools	30 ..
Received membership dues for 1901-2 from 133 schools	665 ..
Received membership dues for 1902-3 from four schools	20 ..
Amount of receipts to Nov. 29, 1902.....	\$1 030 65

Disbursements

For printing, binding and distributing proceedings 1901	\$366 27
Other printing	39 25
Postage, expressage and telegrams.....	49 97
Expenses of the executive committee.....	67 78
Stationery	6 ..
Services of a stenographer	60 66
Typewriting	27 80
Amount of disbursements	\$617 73
Balance in the hands of the treasurer, Nov. 29, 1902..	\$412 92

Miscel-
laneous
business

Six schools are in arrears for membership dues of 1899-1900; 10 for 1900-1; and 37 for 1901-2. The balance in the treasurer's hands with these arrearages, the greater part of which will doubtless be paid, and with the dues for the incoming year, will more than suffice for the probable expenditures of the association during 1902-3.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. KIEFFER, *Treasurer*

Lancaster Pa. Nov. 28, 1902

Report of auditing committee

The committee appointed to audit the account of Prof. John B. Kieffer, treasurer of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, beg leave to report that the account submitted has been examined and found correct.

J. ELLIOTT GILPIN

SAMUEL COLE FAIRLEY

Adopted

Committees selected

The president announced that it was necessary to appoint five representatives from the secondary schools on the College Entrance Examination Board, and, as the report of the secretary of the board closes with the recommendation that the committee be reappointed to continue the work, the executive committee had accordingly reappointed the following persons: Dr Julius Sachs, New York; Mr Wilson Farrand, New Jersey; Dr James G. Croswell, New York; Dr S. J. McPherson, Lawrenceville N. J.; and Dr James L. Patterson, Philadelphia Pa.

Professor Hale moved that the committee on entrance requirements in English should be continued. The committee consists of Professor Francis Hovey Stoddard, Head Master Wilson Farrand and Professor Franklin T. Baker.

Adopted

Resolution of thanks

Dean Crane — Mr President: I move that the thanks of this association be given to the John Hopkins University and the Woman's College of Baltimore for the cordial welcome and generous hospitality they have extended to this association.

It has always seemed to me that one of the most valuable features of these meetings was the opportunity to make the personal acquaintance of our colleagues and to exchange our views on points of common interest. This can be done only at such social meetings as the hospitality of Baltimore has rendered possible.

Adopted

Officers. The committee on nominations reported the following for officers of the association for the coming year:

President, President Ira Remsen, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Md.

Vice presidents, Principal Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders, Balliol School, Utica N. Y.; Dr S. J. McPherson, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville N. J.; President James D. Moffatt, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington Pa.; Principal A. H. Berlin, Wilmington High School, Wilmington Del.; President Francis A. Soper, Baltimore City College, Baltimore Md.

Secretary, Dr Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Treasurer, Professor John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa.

Executive committee, President, secretary and treasurer *ex officio*; also Head Master Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, Newark N. J.; Dr James Russell Parsons jr, University of the State of New York, Albany N. Y.; Professor Louis Bevier jr, Rutgers College, New Brunswick N. J.; Professor Edward Everett Hale jr, Union College, Schenectady N. Y.

These officers were elected.

Adjourned

HERMAN V. AMES, *Secretary*

Notice. The next annual convention of the association will be held Nov. 27 and 28, 1903, at Columbia University, New York city.

LIST OF MEMBERS 1902-3

List of
members

LOCATION	INSTITUTION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
Albany N. Y.	Albany Academy.....	Henry P. Warren L.H.D.
Albany N. Y.	Univ. of the State of N. Y.	Sec. James Russell Parsons Jr. M.A. LL.D.
Alfred N. Y.	Alfred University.....	Bothe C. Davis Ph.D.
Allegheny Pa.	Allegheny Preparatory Sch.	Henry C. Pearson
Allegheny Pa.	Western Univ. of Pa.....	W. J. Holland Ph.D. D.D.
Allentown Pa.	Muhlenberg College.....	Theodore L. Seip D.D.
Annandale N. Y.	St Stephen's College.....	Rev. Lawrence T. Cole Ph.D.
Annapolis Md.	St John's College.....	Thomas Fell Ph.D. LL.D.
Annville Pa.	Lebanon Valley College.....	Hervin U. Roop M.A. Ph.D.
Asbury Park N. J.	Asbury Park High School.....	Frederick S. Shepherd
Aurora N. Y.	Wells College.....	Jasper W. Freley
Baltimore Md. (714)		
St Paul street)	Arundell School for Girls....	Elizabeth Maxwell Carroll, B.A.
Baltimore Md.	Baltimore City College.....	Francis A. Soper M.A.
Baltimore Md.	Bryn Mawr School.....	Edith Hamilton
Baltimore Md.	(The) Country School.....	Roland J. Mulford
Baltimore Md.	Friends School.....	John W. Gregg M.A.
Baltimore Md.	Girls Latin School.....	W. H. Shelley
Baltimore Md.	Johns Hopkins Univ.....	Ira Remsen LL.D.
Baltimore Md. (1405)		
Park av.)	The Randolph-Harrison Sch.	Mrs Alexander Randall
Baltimore Md.	Woman's College.....	J. F. Goucher
Bayonne N. J.	Bayonne City High School.	P. H. Smith
Bethlehem Pa.	Bethlehem Preparatory Sch.	H. A. Foering
Bethlehem Pa.	Moravian Parochial School.	Albert G. Rau B.S.
Bethlehem Pa.	Moravian Seminary.....	J. Max Hark D.D.
Beverly N. J.	Farnum Preparatory School.	James B. Dilks
Birmingham Pa.	Mountain Seminary.....	{ Miss N. J. Davis { Miss S. M. Gallaher M.A.
Blairstown N. J.	Blair Presbyterial Academy..	John C. Sharpe
Blairsville Pa.	Blairsville College.....	Rev. S. B. Linhart
Bloomsburg Pa.	State Normal School.....	Judson Perry Welsh M.A. Ph.D.
Bordentown N. J.	Bordentown Military Inst...	Thomas H. Landon
Bridgeton N. J.	West Jersey Academy.....	Phoebe W. Lyon M.A.
Brooklyn N. Y.	Adelphi College.....	Charles H. Levermore Ph.D.
Brooklyn N. Y. (183		
Lincoln place)	Berkeley Institute.....	Julian W. Abernethy Ph.D.
Brooklyn N. Y.	Boys High School.....	John Mickleborough
Brooklyn N. Y.	Brooklyn Polytechnic Inst.	Lawrence C. Hull
Brooklyn N. Y.	Erasmus Hall High School.	W. B. Gunnison
Brooklyn N. Y.	Manual Training High Sch.	Charles D. Larkins Ph.B.
Brooklyn N. Y.	Packer Institute.....	Truman J. Backus LL.D.
Brooklyn N. Y.	Pratt Institute.....	Luther Gulick
Bryn Mawr Pa.	Bryn Mawr College.....	Miss M. Carey Thomas Ph.D. LL.D.
Bryn Mawr Pa.	Miss Baldwin's School.....	Florence Baldwin
Buffalo N. Y.	Canisius College.....	Rev. Aloysius Pfeil
Burlington N. J.	St Mary's Hall.....	John Fearnley M.A.
Bustleton Pa.	St Luke's School.....	Charles H. Strout
Canandaigua N. Y.	Granger Place School	Samuel C. Fairley
Canton N. Y.	St Lawrence Univ.....	Almon Gunnison D.D. LL.D.
Carlisle Pa.	Dickinson College.....	George Edward Reed D.D. LL.D.
Chambersburg Pa.	Wilson College.....	Rev. Samuel A. Martin D.D.
Chester Pa.	Chester High School.....	T. S. Cole B.A.
Chestertown Md.	Washington College.....	Charles W. Reid Ph.D.
Chestnut Hill Pa.	Chestnut Hill Academy.....	James L. Patterson
Clinton N. Y.	Hamilton College.....	M. Woolsey Stryker D.D. LL.D.
Collegeville Pa.	Ursinus College...	Henry T. Spangler D.D.

132 ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

List of members	LOCATION	INSTITUTION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
	Dobbs Ferry N. Y.	The Mackenzie School.....	Rev. James C. Mackenzie Ph.D.
	Dover Del.	Conference Academy.....	Rev. V. S. Collins
	East Orange N. J.	East Orange High School.....	Charles W. Evans
	Easton Pa.	Easton High School.....	B. F. Sandt
	Easton Pa.	Lafayette College.....	Ethelbert D. Warfield LL.D.
	Frederick Md.	Woman's College.....	Joseph H. Apple M.A.
	Garden City L. I.	Cathedral Sch. of St Paul's.	Frederick L. Gamage M.A.
	Geneva N. Y.	Hobart College.....	Rev. Robert Ellis Jones B.A. D.D.
	George School Pa.	George School.....	J. S. Walton Ph.D.
	Georgetown D. C.	Georgetown College.....	Father J. D. Whitney
	Germantown Pa.	Friends School.....	Davis H. Forsythe
	Germantown Pa.	Germantown Academy.....	William Kershaw Ph.D.
	Hamilton N. Y.	Colgate Academy.....	Frank L. Shepardson M.A.
	Hamilton N. Y.	Colgate University.....	George E. Merrill D.D. LL.D.
	Harrisburg Pa.	Harrisburg High School.....	Samuel A. Baer
	Haverford Pa.	Haverford College.....	Isaac Sharpless LL.D.
	Haverford Pa.	Haverford College Grammar School.....	Charles S. Crossman
	Hightstown N. J.	Peddie Institute.....	Roger W. Swetland B.A.
	Ithaca N. Y.	Cornell University.....	J. G. Schurman M.A. D.Sc. LL.D.
	Ithaca N. Y.	Ithaca High School.....	F. D. Boynton
	Lancaster Pa.	Franklin & Marshall College	John S. Stahr Ph.D. D.D.
	Lancaster Pa.	Yeates Institute.....	Rev. Frederick Gardiner
	Lawrence N. Y.	Lawrence School.....	H. D. Pettit M.A.
	Lawrenceville N. J.	Lawrenceville School.....	S. J. McPherson Ph.D.
	Lewisburg Pa.	Bucknell University.....	John H. Harris D.D.
	Lititz Pa.	Linden Hall Seminary.....	Rev. C. L. Moench
	McDonogh Md.	McDonogh School.....	Sidney T. Moreland
	Meadville Pa.	Allegheny College.....	William H. Crawford D.D.
	Mercersburg Pa.	Mercersburg Academy.....	William Mann Irvine Ph.D.
	Millersville Pa.	First Pa. State Normal Sch.	E. Oram Lyte M.A. Ph.D
	Montclair N. J.	Montclair Military Academy	John G. Mae Vicar
	Montclair N. J.	Montclair Public School.....	Randall Spaulding B.A.
	Morristown N. J.	Morristown School.....	Francis C. Woodman
	Myerstown Pa.	Albright College.....	Clellan A. Brown
	New Brunswick N. J.	Rutgers College.....	Austin Scott Ph.D. LL.D.
	New Brunswick N. J.	Rutgers Prep. Academy.....	Eliot R. Payson Ph.D.
	New York city (117 W. 125th street))	Barnard School for Boys.....	William Livingston Hazen B.A. LL.B.
	New York city.....	Brearley School.....	J. G. Croswell B.A.
	New York city (721 Madison avenue))	Chapin Collegiate School.....	Henry B. Chapin Ph.D. D.D.
	New York city (30 W. 16th street))	Col. of St Francis Xavier.	Rev. D. W. Hearn S.J.
	New York city (241 W. 77th street))	Collegiate School.....	L. C. Mygatt
	New York city (34 and 36 E. 51st street))	Columbia Grammar School.	Benjamin Howell Campbell M.A.
	New York city.....	Columbia University.....	Nicholas Murray Butler Ph.D. LL.D.
	New York city (20 E. 50th street))	Cutler School.....	A. H. Cutler
	New York city (60 W. 13th street))	De Witt Clinton High School	John T. Buchanan M.A.
	New York city (226 E. 16th street))	Friends Seminary.....	Edward B. Rawson B.S.
	New York city (54 W. 84th street))	Irving School.....	Louis Dwight Ray M.A. Ph.D.
	New York city (Grand Boulevard & 131st street))	Manhattan College.....	Bro. Justin F. S.C.

LOCATION	INSTITUTION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION	List of members
New York city (340)			
W. 86th street)	Misses Ely's School.....	Elizabeth L. Ely	
New York city.....	New York University.....	Henry M. MacCracken D.D. LL.D.	
New York city (3080)			
3d avenue).....	Peter Cooper High School..	Edward J. Goodwin Lit.D.	
New York city (38 W.			
59th street).....	Sachs Collegiate Inst.....	Julius Sachs B.A. Ph.D.	
New York city (114th			
st and 7th av.).....	Wadleigh High School.....	John G. Wight Ph.D.	
Newark Del.....	Delaware College.....	George A. Harter M.A. Ph.D.	
Newark N. J.....	Newark Academy.....	JS. A. Farrand Ph.D. Wilson Farrand	
Newark N. J.....	Newark Public High School	E. O. Hovey Ph.D.	
N. Plainfield N. J...	High School.....	H. J. Wightman	
Ocean Grove N. J...	Neptune Township High Sch.	L. A. Doren	
Ogontz Pa.....	Cheltenham Academy.....	John D. Skilton	
Orange N. J.....	Dearborn-Morgan School.....	David A. Kennedy Ph.D.	
Ossining N. Y.....	Dr Holbrook's School.....	Dwight Holbrook Ph.D.	
Ossining N. Y.....	Mt Pleasant Academy.....	C. F. Brusie M.A. and A. T. Emory B.A.	
Palmyra N. Y.....	Classical High School.....	W. J. Deans	
Peekskill N. Y.....	Mohegan Lake School.....	Henry Waers M.A.	
Pennsburg Pa.....	Perkiomen Seminary.....	Rev. O. S. Kriebel M.A.	
Philadelphia (2011)			
DeLancey place).....	(The) Agnes Irwin School..	Sophy Dallas Irwin	
Philadelphia.....	Drexel Institute of Art, Sci- ence and Industry.....	James MacAlister LL.D.	
Philadelphia.....	Episcopal Academy.....	William H. Klapp M.A. M.D.	
Philadelphia (15th			
and Race streets).....	Friends Central High Sch....	{ Boys dep't, J. Eugene Baker Girls dep't, Annie Shoemaker	
Philadelphia (140 N.			
16th street).....	Friends Select School.....	J. Henry Bartlett	
Philadelphia (17th &			
Spring Garden st.)	Girls High School.....	W. D. Rorer M.A.	
Philadelphia (1720)			
Arch street).....	Philadelphia Collegiate Inst.		
	for Girls.....	Susan C. Lodge	
Philadelphia (13th &			
Spring Garden st.)	Phila. Normal Sch. for Girls	J. Monroe Willard	
Philadelphia Pa.....	Temple College.....	Rev. R. H. Conwell	
Philadelphia Pa.....	University of Pennsylvania	Charles C. Harrison LL.D.	
Pittsburg Pa.....	Alinda Preparatory School..	Ella Gordon Stuart	
Pittsburg Pa.....	Central High School.....	Charles B. Wood M.A.	
Pittsburg Pa.....	Shady Side Academy.....	W. R. Crabbe Ph.D.	
Pittsburg Pa. (Shady			
avenue).....	Thurston Preparatory Sch....	Alice M. Thurston	
Poanctie Hills N. Y.	St Matthews Military Sch...	O. Legare Rogers Ph.B.	
Port Deposit Md.....	Tome Institute.....	A. W. Harris Ph.D. Sc.D.	
Pottstown Pa.....	Hill School.....	John Meigs Ph.D.	
Poughkeepsie N. Y.	Riverview Academy.....	J. B. Bisbee M. A.	
Poughkeepsie N. Y.	Vassar College.....	James M. Taylor D.D. LL.D.	
Princeton N. J.....	Princeton University.....	Woodrow Wilson LL.D.	
Reading Pa.....	Boys High School.....	Charles S. Foos	
Redbank N. J.....	High School.....	S. V. Arrowsmith	
Rochester N. Y.....	University of Rochester.....	Rush Rhees LL.D.	
Rye N. Y.....	Rye Seminary.....	Mrs Life and the Misses Stowe	
Schenectady N. Y...	Union Classical Inst.....	Arthur Marvin M.A.	
Schenectady N. Y...	Union University.....	A. V. V. Raymond D.D. LL.D.	
S. Bethlehem Pa....	Lehigh University.....	Thomas Messinger Drown LL.D.	
S. Orange N. J.....	High School.....	George J. McAndrew M.A.	
Stapleton L. I.....	Staten Island Academy.....	Frederick E. Partington M.A.	
State College Pa....	Pa. State College.....	George W. Atherton LL.D.	
Summit N. J.....	Kent Place School.....	Sarah Woodman Paul	

134 ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

Delegates registered	LOCATION	INSTITUTION	HEAD OF INSTITUTION
	Swarthmore Pa.	Swarthmore College.....	Joseph Swain LL.D.
	Swarthmore Pa.	Swarthmore Prep. School.....	Arthur H. Tomlinson
	Syracuse N. Y.	Syracuse University.....	Rev. James Roscoe Day S.T.D. LL.D.
	Trenton N. J.	State Model School.....	James M. Green Ph.D.
	Utica N. Y.	The Balliol School.....	{ Mrs. Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders Ph.D. Edith Rockwell Hall
	Utica N. Y.	Utica Free Academy.....	A. L. Goodrich B.A.
	Warren Pa.	Warren High School.....	W. L. MacGowan
	Washington D. C.	Catholic Univ. of America.....	Rt. Rev. Mgr. D. R. O'Connell D.D. LL.D.
	Washington D. C.	Columbian University.....	Charles W. Needham D.D. LL.D.
	Washington D. C.	Friends Select School.....	{ Thomas W. Sidwell Frances Haldeman Sidwell
	Washington D. C.	Gallaudet College.....	Edward Minor Gallaudet Ph.D. LL.D.
	Washington D. C.	Howard University.....	J. E. Rankin LL.D.
	Washington D. C.	The University School.....	Robert L. Preston
	(Wisconsin av.)	The Washington School for Boys.....	Louis L. Hooper
	Washington Pa.	Trinity Hall.....	William W. Smith
	Washington Pa.	Washington & Jefferson Col.	James D. Moffatt D.D.
	Waynesburg Pa.	Waynesburg College.....	A. E. Turner
	West Chester Pa.	State Normal School.....	G. M. Phillips M.A. Ph.D.
	West Chester Pa.	West Chester High School.....	Addison L. Jones
	Westminster Md.	Western Maryland College ..	T. H. Lewis
	Westtown Pa.	Westtown School.....	William F. Wickersham M.A.
	Wilmington Del.	Friends School.....	Herschel A. Norris M.A.
	Yonkers N. Y.	Halsted School	Mary S. Jenkins
	Yonkers N. Y.	Yonkers High School.....	William A. Edwards
	York Pa.	Collegiate Institute.....	E. T. Jeffers

DELEGATES REGISTERED 1902

Albright College, Myerstown Pa. Aaron E. Gobble, William P. Winter, J. D. Woodring

Alinda Preparatory School, Pittsburg Pa. Ella Gordon Stuart

Balliol School, Utica N. Y. Miss E. R. Hall, Mrs A. P. Saunders

Baltimore Md. Louise P. du Bellet

Baltimore (Md.) City College. Pres. Francis A. Soper, vice Pres. Charles F. Raddatz

Barnard College, New York. Dean Laura D. Gill

Beaver (Pa.) College. Pres. Arthur Staples

Berkeley Institute, Brooklyn N. Y. Prin. J. W. Abernethy

Blairsville (Pa.) College. Pres. S. B. Linhart

Bordentown (N. J.) Military Institute. Rev. Thompson H. Landon

Boys High School, Brooklyn N. Y. O. D. Clark

Carnegie Institution, Baltimore Md. D. C. Gilman

Central High School, Philadelphia Pa. Prof. Francis Burke Brandt, Cheesman A. Herrick

Central Manual Training School, Philadelphia Pa. R. H. Bradbury Ph.D. Edward A. Partridge, Prin. William L. Sayre

Cheltenham Academy, Ogontz Pa. Fred J. Doolittle, Prin. John D. Skilton

Chestnut Hill Academy, Philadelphia Pa. Head Master James L. Patterson

Collegiate School, New York. Prin. L. C. Mygatt

Columbia University, New York. Dr Leopold Bahlsen, James H. Canfield, librarian, Prof. Thomas S. Fiske, Dr A. C. Howland, Mrs A. C. Howland, Sec. F. P. Keppel, Dean James E. Russell

Commercial High School for Girls, Philadelphia Pa. Lucille Andrews, Anna V. ~~Delegates registered~~ Beck, Amanda C. Beitler, Prin. Emily L. Graham, Mary S. Holmes, Mary G. Umsted

Concordville Pa. Mrs Joseph Shortlidge

Cornell University, Ithaca N. Y. Dean T. F. Crane, Charles DeGarmo Ph.D.

Country School, Baltimore Md. Roland J. Mulford

Delaware College, Newark Del. Elisha Conover, Edgar Dawson, Pres. George H. Harter

DeWitt Clinton High School, New York. C. F. Kayser, Prof. Mervin G. Filler

Drexel Institute, Philadelphia Pa. Maude G. Hopkins

Dr Holbrook's School, Ossining N. Y. Dwight Holbrook

Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn N. Y. Charles S. Estes

Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa. Pres. John S. Stahr

Friends Central School, Philadelphia Pa. J. Eugene Baker, W. E. Barrett, Edward Clirlson, A. Jennie Cornell, Mary J. Elliott. Prin. Anna Walter Speakman B.A., Sarah Hall Stirling B.A.

Friends Select School, Philadelphia Pa. Mary Anna Jones, Henry Arnold Todd

Friends Select School, Washington D. C. Thomas W. Sidwell, Mrs Thomas W. Sidwell

Gallaudet College, Washington D. C. Herbert E. Day, Pres. E. M. Gallaudet

Germantown Friends School, Philadelphia Pa. Prin. Davis H. Forsythe, Jane Shoemaker Jones

George School, George School Pa. Joseph S. Walton, Mrs Walton

Girard College, Philadelphia Pa. Alfred N. Seal

Girls High School, Philadelphia Pa. Virginia Baldwin, Rachael P. Barker, Emma H. Carroll, Ada B. Curtis, Adah V. Hubbs, J. H. Humphries, Ida A. Keller, Louise Kromer, Elizabeth W. Massinger, Katharine E. Puncheon, Prin. William D. Rorer, Emma L. G. Thomas

Girls Latin School, Baltimore Md. Anna Latimer Bacon, Catharine C. Cleveland A. Laura Emiger, Dora Johnson, Jessie M. Loeffler, Edith S. Merritt, Amelie F. Tournier, Harlan Updegraff, Jeannette L. Wilmot, Nellie M. Wilmot

Granger Place School, Canandaigua N. Y. Prin. Samuel Cole Fairley

Halsted School, Yonkers N. Y. Prin. Mary Sicard Jenkins

Harvard University, Cambridge Mass. Prof. F. W. Fairfield

High School of Commerce, New York. Prin. James J. Sheppard, James Sullivan Ph.D.

Hills Lyman's School, Philadelphia Pa. Valentine Touner

Kent Place School, Summit N. J. Mrs S. W. Paul, Prin. A. S. Vordinen

Kiskiminetas Springs School, Saltsburg Pa. Prin. R. W. Fair

Landsdowne Pa. Mrs J. Eugene Baker, Anna Woolman

Linden Hall Seminary, Lititz Pa. Prin. Charles D. Kreider, Mrs Kreider

Lincoln C. G. S. Philadelphia Pa. Emanuella Kromer

Loyola College, Baltimore Md. Rev. M. A. McLoughlin S.J., Rev. J. I. Ziegler S.J.

McDonogh (Md.) School. Prin. S. T. Moreland

Manhattan College, New York. Brother Jerome, president

Manual Training School, Wilmington Del. Grace L. Smith

Maplewood Institute, Concordville Del. co. Pa. Prin. Joseph Shortlidge

Maryland Agricultural College, College Park Md. Pres. R. W. Selvecte

Maryland State Normal School, Baltimore Md. Herbert E. Austin, Sarah E. Richmond

Delegates registered

Miss Baldwin's School, Bryn Mawr Pa. Jane L. Brownell
Misses Ely's School for Girls, New York. Elizabeth L. Ely, Helen A. Gavil
Miss Stahr's School, Lancaster Pa. Grace Pheinsty, Helen R. Stahr
Mohegan (N. Y.) Lake School. H. Waters, Mrs H. Waters
Montclair (N. J.) High School. Mary North
Moravian Parochial School, Bethlehem Pa. Edwin M. Fagel, Albert G. Rau
Moravian Seminary, Bethlehem Pa. Laurence C. Brikenstein
Mountain Seminary, Birmingham Pa. Miss Davis, *principal*
National Park Seminary, Forest Glen Md. Ida Munae
Neptune Township High School, Ocean Grove N. J. Mrs A. Clark, L. A. Doren
Newark (N. J.) Academy. Emmons Bryant, Head master Wilson Farrand
New York N. Y. F. C. Hodgdon; *Trunk Line Ass'n*, G. W. Smith; *American Book Co.*, J. R. Fairchild; *D. Appleton & Co.*, A. L. Hart; *local school board*, Miss E. O. Brownell
New York (N. Y.) University. Prof. Francis Hovey Stoddard
Northeast Manual Training School, Philadelphia Pa. V. B. Brecht, Prin. Andrew J. Morrison
Philadelphia Pa. H. J. Turner Ph.D.; *D. Appleton & Co.*, E. W. Moore; *Ginn & Co.*, H. A. Coffin
Philadelphia (Pa.) Collegiate Institute for Girls. Susan C. Lodge
Philadelphia (Pa.) High School for Girls. Blanche Baldwin
Philadelphia (Pa.) Normal School. Mary Adair, Alice H. Beckler, Mary E. Divier, Emma C. Harlen, Lila Strong Jones, Eleanor S. Lungren, Mary C. Peacock, Margaret S. Pickard, Maria P. Ryan, Pauline W. Spencer, Grace E. Spiegler, Elizabeth S. Tait, Prin. J. Monroe Willard; Elizabeth N. Woolman
Princeton (N. J.) University. Prof. Jesse Benedict Carter
Public High School, Montclair N. J. Randall Spaulding
Riverview Academy, Poughkeepsie N. Y. Josiah Bartlett
Rutgers College, New Brunswick N. J. Louis Bevier jr Ph.D.
Sachs' Collegiate Institute, New York. Dr Julius Sachs
Shady Side Academy, Pittsburgh Pa. Prin. W. R. Crabbe, C. M. Murray
St John's College, Annapolis Md. Pres. Thomas Fell LL.D., J. B. White
State Normal School, Bloomsburg Pa. Paul F. Peck
State Normal School, Metuchen N. J. Harriet Alden
State Normal School, Trenton N. J. Sarah A. Dynes, Dr J. M. Green, Margaret B. MacDonald
Staunton Va. John H. Bader
Stevens School, Germantown Pa. Mrs J. F. Deipps, *principal*
Swarthmore (Pa.) College. Pres. Joseph Swain
Syracuse (N. Y.) University. Herbert M. Burchard, Prof. Edgar C. Morris
Temple College, Philadelphia Pa. Barclay W. Bradley, Arthur B. Turner
Tome Institute. Thomas L. Balcer
Union College, Schenectady N. Y. Prof. Edward E. Hale jr, Pres. Andrew V. V. Raymond
United States Naval Academy, Annapolis Md. Prof. N. Marion
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa. Herman V. Ames, E. P. Cheyney, George S. Fullerton, Lightner Witmer
University School for Boys, Baltimore Md. William Tappan

University of the State of New York, Albany N. Y. Arthur G. Clement, Charles **Officers**
 Newell Cobb, Henry L. Taylor, Eugene W. Lyttle
Ursinus College, Collegeville Pa. J. Lyman Barnard, Pres. Henry T. Spangler
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie N. Y. Professors A. Leach, Lucy M. Salmon;
 Pres. J. M. Taylor
Vienna Academy, Vienna Md. E. F. Webb
Wadleigh High School, New York. Martha Bunting, John G. Wight, Mrs John
 G. Wight
Washington Pa. W. W. Smith
Washington D. C. Ellen H. Vinton
Washington College, Chestertown Md. Pres. C. W. Reid
Washington (D. C.) School. Louise L. Hooper
Washington (D. C.) School for Boys. C. S. Ingham, Howard R. Van Law
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington Pa. Pres. James D. Moffat
Western Maryland College, Westminster Md. W. R. McDaniel M.A., George
 S. Wills
West Jersey Academy, Bridgeton N. J. Prin. Phoebus W. Lyon
Westtown (Pa.) Boarding School. W. H. Elfreth, Prin. William F. Wickersham
Wilmington (Del.) Friends School. Prin. Herschel A. Norris
Wilson College, Chambersburg Pa. Nancy J. Criswell, May DeB. McCurdy
Woman's College, Frederick Md. Pres. J. H. Apple, M. M. Kerr, W. D. Lantz,
 Maude E. Miner
Woman's College, Baltimore Md. Elma Latimer Bacon, Grace Patton Conant,
 Prof. H. Frolicher, C. W. Hodell, William H. Hopkins, Eleanor L. Lord
Yeates Institute, Lancaster Pa. Newell A. Barker, Head Master Frederick
 Gardiner
York (Pa.) Collegiate Institute. Pres. E. T. Jeffers

OFFICERS IN PREVIOUS YEARS¹

FOR 1898-99

President

President Isaac Sharpless, Haverford (Pa.) College

Vice presidents

Rt. Rev. Mgr. Conaty, Catholic University

President Thomas M. Drown, Lehigh University

Professor J. W. Jenks, Cornell University

Principal Charles D. Larkins, Brooklyn Manual Training High
 School

Professor Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College

Principal William F. Wickersham, Westtown Pa.

Secretary

Dr Merrick Whitcomb, University of Pennsylvania

¹ A list of officers of the association from 1887-98 inclusive may be found in the proceedings of the 11th annual convention.

Officers

Treasurer

Professor John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College

Executive committee

President, secretary and treasurer, ex officio

Professor Dana C. Munro, University of Pennsylvania

Dr Julius Sachs, New York

President James M. Green, Trenton Normal School

Dean Emily Jones Smith, Barnard College

FOR 1899 1900

President

Principal John G. Wight, Wadleigh High School, New York

Vice presidents

Principal Thomas W. Sidwell, Friends Select School, Washington D. C.

Principal James M. Green, State Normal School, Trenton N. J.

President T. H. Lewis, Western Maryland College, Westminster Md.

President Henry T. Spangler, Ursinus College, Collegeville Pa.

Principal A. H. Berlin, Wilmington (Del.) High School

President M. Woolsey Stryker, Hamilton College, Clinton N. Y.

Secretary

Dr Merrick Whitcomb, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Acting secretary

Dr Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

Treasurer

Professor John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa.

Executive committee

President, secretary and treasurer, ex officio

President Isaac Sharpless, Haverford (Pa.) College

Principal Randall Spaulding, Montclair N. J.

Professor Dana C. Munro, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Professor E. E. Hale jr, Union College, Schenectady N. Y.

FOR 1900-1

*President***Officers**

President Andrew V. V. Raymond, Union University, Schenectady N. Y.

Vice presidents

Principal James G. Croswell, Brearley School, New York

President William W. Birdsall, Swarthmore College, Pa.

Principal J. Monroe Willard, Philadelphia Normal School for Girls, Pa.

Principal Eli M. Lamb, Friends School, Baltimore Md.

Professor Charles De Garmo, Cornell University, Ithaca N. Y.

Principal S. J. McPherson, Lawrenceville School, N. J.

Secretary

Dr Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Treasurer

Professor John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa.

Executive committee

President, secretary and treasurer, ex officio

Dr John G. Wight, Wadleigh High School, New York

Professor Dana C. Munro, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Dean Horatio S. White, Cornell University, Ithaca N. Y.

Dr John Meigs, Hill School, Pottstown Pa.

FOR 1901-2

President

Head Master Wilson Farrand, Newark (N. J.) Academy

Vice presidents

Professor Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie N. Y.

Principal A. L. Goodrich, Utica (N. Y.) Free Academy

Principal Charles W. Evans, East Orange (N. J.) High School

Professor Louis Bevier jr, Rutgers College, New Brunswick N. J.

Dr W. R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy, Pittsburg Pa.

President George A. Harter, Delaware College, Newark Del

Secretary

Dr Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

140 ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

Officers

Treasurer

Professor John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa.

Executive committee

President, secretary and treasurer ex officio

President A. V. V. Raymond, Union University, Schenectady N. Y.

Professor Dana C. Munro, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Professor James H. Robinson, Columbia University, New York
Superintendent Randall Spaulding, Montclair N. J.

OFFICERS FOR 1902-3

President

President Ira Remsen, John Hopkins University, Baltimore Md.

Vice presidents

Principal Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders, Balliol School, Utica N. Y.

Dr S. J. McPherson, Lawrenceville (N. J.) School

President James D. Moffatt, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington Pa.

Principal A. H. Berlin, Wilmington (Del.) High School

President Francis A. Soper, Baltimore (Md.) City College

Secretary

Dr Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Pa.

Treasurer

Professor John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster Pa.

Executive committee

President, secretary and treasurer ex officio

Wilson Farrand, Newark (N. J.) Academy

James Russell Parsons jr, University of State of New York, Albany N. Y.

Professor Louis Bevier jr, Rutgers College, New Brunswick N. J.

Professor Edward Everett Hale jr, Union College, Schenectady N. Y.

PUBLICATION OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1902¹

Publication 1902

Proceedings of the 15th Annual Convention of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, held at Syracuse University, Syracuse N. Y., Nov. 29 and 30, 1901. University of the State of New York. Regents bulletin 57. March 1902.

Address of welcome, Chancellor James R. Day

Response, President Andrew V. V. Raymond

The Elective System and a Liberal Education, Professor James H. Robinson
Discussion, Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, Principal A. L. Goodrich, President
Rush Rhees, President M. Woolsey Stryker, Professor Louis Bevier jr

Freedom of Speech in Connection with Education

Rights of Donors, St Clair McKelway

Duty of the Institution to Maintain Freedom of Speech, President J. G. Schurman

Discussion, James C. Colgate, President W. H. P. Faunce, Hon. Alton B. Parker

President's address: The Ethical Element in Education

Report of College Entrance Examination Board. President Nicholas Murray Butler

How Should the Entrance Examination Paper in English be Constructed? Professor Edward Everett Hale jr. Discussion, Mrs Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders, Inspector Charles Davidson, Principal William K. Wickes

Miscellaneous business

Conference of history teachers

1 A list of the publications of the association since 1887, together with the titles of papers contained therein, as also the constitution of the association, may be found in the proceedings of the 15th annual convention.

INDEX

Accrediting schools, methods in use of, 20-30; possible effects of, 37-38. Admission to college, should admission be by examination or by certificate, papers and discussion, 8-47; method of, 99; age, 100; requirements for, 97-99. American system of education, 18-19. Angell, James B., quoted, 29. Auditing committee, 127; report, 129.

Baxter, Richard, quoted, 9. Bevier, Louis, jr., on effect of college entrance examinations, 44-46. Brice, quoted, 74. Brownell, Jane L., on effect of college entrance examinations on the secondary schools, 30-35.

Canfield, James H., on relative functions and powers of president, trustees and faculty, 75-80. Carter, J. B., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 125-26. Certification vs examination system for admission to college, papers and discussion, 20-47. Cheyney, Edward P., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 121-24. Clarke, James Freeman, quoted, 112. Cobb, Charles N., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 126. College and school, relations between, by Wilson Farrand, 84-101. College Entrance Examination Board, 19, 87; report of, 47-49; appointment of representatives from secondary schools, 129. Columbia conferences, 86. Crane, T. F., on relative functions and powers of president and faculty, 83. **Delegates** registered 1902, 134-37.

Elementary school course, 93-94. English, committee on college entrance requirements, 129; report of, 50-51; work of, 85. English schools, 11-16. Entrance examination board, *see College Entrance Examination Board*. Examination vs certificate system for admission to college, papers and discussion, 8-47.

Faculty, president and trustees, relative functions and powers, papers and discussion, 51-83. Farrand, Wilson, response to address of welcome, 7-8; Existing Relations between School and College, 84-101. Fiske, Thomas S., Report of the College Entrance Examination Board, 47-49. Fröbel, effect of his teaching on American education, 92. Fullerton, George Stuart, on functions and powers of the faculty, 64-75.

German schools, 15-18. Green, James M., on admission to college, 42-44.

Harvard College, entrance requirements, 98. History, construction of entrance examination paper, papers and discussion, 101-27. Honorary degrees, 72-74. Huxley, quoted, 112.

Inspection of schools in accrediting system, 22-23.

Kieffer, John B., report as treasurer, 128-29. Kindergarten, 91-93. Kipling, Rudyard, quoted, 12-13, 18.

Lord, Eleanor L., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 126-27.

Lyttle, E. W., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 124.

McPherson, Simon J., on functions and powers of trustees, 57-64.

Members, list of 1902-3, 131-34.

Moreland, Sidney T., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 126.

National Educational Association, work of committees, 84-85, 87.

Nominations, committee on, 128.

Officers for 1898-1903, 137-40.

Options, in entrance requirements, 98-99; in examination questions, 109.

President, trustees and faculty, relative functions and powers, papers and discussion, 51-83.

Professional schools, 94-95.

Publication of association for 1902, 141.

Remsen, Ira, address of welcome, 5-7; Relative Functions and Powers of President, Trustees and Faculty, 51-57.

Russell, James E., Educational Value of Examinations as the Culmination of the Preparatory Course, 8-19; on admission to college, 46.

Sachs, Julius, on effect of college entrance examinations on the secondary school, 35-39; on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 125.

Sadler, Michael E., quoted, 11-12, 15.

Salmon, Lucy M., How Should the Entrance Examination Paper in History be Constructed, 101-14.

School, relations with college, by Wilson Farrand, 84-101.

See also Secondary schools.

Secondary schools, effect of college entrance examinations on, 30-39.

Sessions, summary of, 3-4.

Seth, James, quoted, 113.

Shephard, Henry E., on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 124-25.

State University of Iowa, accrediting system, 23.

Stoddard, Francis H., Report of Committee on College Entrance Requirements in English, 50-51.

Sullivan, James, on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 114-21.

Swain, Joseph, on admission to college, 42.

Taylor, Henry L., on admission to college, 46-47.

Taylor, James M., on relative functions and powers of president, trustees and faculty, 80-83.

Technical schools, 94-95.

Treasurer's report, 128-29.

Trustees, president and faculty, relative functions and powers, papers and discussion, 51-83.

University of Chicago, accrediting system, 23.

University of Illinois, accrediting system, 23.

University of Michigan, accrediting system, 20-30.

University of Minnesota, State High School Board, 21-22.

University of Wisconsin, accrediting system, 23.

Van Dyke, Paul, on construction of entrance examination paper in history, 124.

White, Andrew D., quoted, 17-18.

Whitney, A. S., Methods in Use of Accrediting Schools, 20-30.

Witmer, Lightner, on admission to college, 39-41.

